

**2003 NCAA
CONVENTION
PROCEEDINGS**

**S
G
N
D
E
H
U
P
O
R
C
E
D
I
N
G
S
P
R
O
C
E
D
I
N
G
S**

97th Annual Convention

January 11-13, 2003

Anaheim, California



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222
317/917-6222

Edited By: Michael V. Earle, *Publishing Manager.*

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 12, 2003

The opening session of the 97th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the Disneyland Hotel, Anaheim, California, was called to order at 4:30 p.m., with Robert Lawless, chair of the NCAA Executive Committee, presiding.

Opening Remarks

Mr. Lawless: Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to welcome you to the opening session of the 2003 NCAA Convention. As chair of the NCAA Executive Committee, I have the pleasure of moderating this opening session and welcoming you to Anaheim, California.

Hopefully, you have had an opportunity to see one, if not all three, of the new NCAA public service announcements. We are at a historical point in time as the Association has begun a multi-dimensional messaging campaign to educate the public about the academic and athletic mission of the NCAA. The campaign uses the combined platforms of television, radio, print and outdoor advertising, all largely made available through the NCAA new rights agreements. These multiple applications will start to drive attention to the NCAA's unique attributes, raise awareness of the NCAA's commitment to the academic and athletics components of the student-athlete experience and to put a face on the NCAA, the face of the student-athlete. These PSAs are a direct example of the branding initiative and the public affair plan in motion.

I hope you enjoyed last night's tribute to Cedric W. Dempsey, NCAA president emeritus. Ced is truly a remarkable colleague who has contributed greatly to the world of intercollegiate athletics and higher education. As one era ends for the NCAA, another begins. The Executive Committee is excited about the future of the NCAA and about the person hired to lead the Association.

At this time, it is my pleasure to introduce Dr. Myles Brand, the NCAA's fourth chief executive officer. (Applause) We will hear from President Brand in a few minutes. Also with me today on the dais are the chairs of the three divisional presidential governing bodies. I am pleased to welcome: Bob Hemenway, University of Kansas, chair of the Division I Board of Directors; Patricia Cormier, Longwood University, chair of the Division II Presidents Council; and Bette Landman, Arcadia University, chair of the Division III Presidents Council. (Applause)

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Lawless: As you know, we have operated with a federated governance structure for five years. The structure provides all of the divisions with the autonomy to address their varied issues. However, it is important for us to keep in mind that we gather annually at the Convention as one Association.

Since restructuring, it has become the responsibility of the Executive Committee to approve the Association's budget, oversee Association-wide issues, initiate and settle litigation and employ the NCAA president. The Executive Committee is composed of 16 chief exec-

utive officers from the three divisions and three non-voting members, the chairs of the Management Councils in Divisions I, II and III. The work of the Executive Committee continues to be aligned with its four strategic priorities, which serve as a framework for the Association's planning and budgeting efforts.

These priorities are: First, to prepare student-athletes for leadership in a dynamic and diverse society; second, to reinforce the values of fairness and integrity in intercollegiate athletics; third, to increase access to higher education and enhance the collegiate experience; and finally, to highlight the capacity of intercollegiate athletics to foster life-long learning and health.

With that in mind, I would like to report briefly on what has been a busy, productive year for this Association. The most significant responsibility for the year was the transition of our Association's leadership. With the announcement in January of Ced Dempsey's retirement came the responsibility to develop a process to identify his replacement. As part of this new process, a search committee was formed, originally consisting of Brit Kirwan of Ohio State University; President Cormier; President Landman; Milton Gordon of California State University, Fullerton; and myself. The original composition changed early in the process when President Kirwan left the Division I Board of Directors and President Hemenway was elected as chair of the Division I Board of Directors. Thus, the search committee that functioned from May through October 2002, was composed of CEOs Cormier, Gordon, Hemenway, Landman and Lawless. I would like to personally thank them for their time and commitment to the presidential search process.

Baker-Parker, an executive search firm from Atlanta, was selected from among two dozen firms to assist with this search. The Executive Committee developed a position description document to provide guidance to the search firm. Baker-Parker solicited recommendations, advice and nominations from a variety of sources, including the NCAA membership, all elements of the governance structure, representatives from the national office, coaching associations, executives of Fortune 200 companies and members of Fortune magazine's "Most Powerful Black Executives" and several national women's associations. As a result of the process, Baker-Parker identified 118 candidates as nominations, 15 of whom were female and 103 of whom were male. The candidates came from intercollegiate athletics, higher education, government and the corporate world.

In August, the search committee selected what it believed to be the best-qualified candidates. In September, the search committee identified 11 of the 12 identified in August, and one withdrew. Ten of those 11 were males, one was a female and three were ethnic minorities.

The search committee narrowed the field to three finalists who were invited to interview with the Executive Committee on October 10, 2002, in Indianapolis. It was the responsibility of the search committee to identify the top candidates, but the responsibility of hiring the president resided with the entire Executive Committee. The Executive Committee was committed to retaining a focus on reform efforts in intercollegiate athletics and hiring an individual who would be a strong advocate for student-athletes. In the final analysis, the Executive Committee selected Myles Brand, who has all the requisite credentials to engage presidents. He also possesses an extensive higher-education background that will help him lead the Association into the future. The announcement of the new president was made at the NCAA headquarters in Indianapolis on October 10.

While we were busy identifying a new president, we continued to deal with the other business of the Association. Since September 11, the insurance industry has significantly increased premiums for its risk and exposures it is absorbing. In April 2002, the Executive Committee appointed a special Risk Management and Insurance Task Force to review the Association's insurance programs. The task force was comprised of campus risk manage-

ment professionals from each division, a representative of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and a student-athlete, and was charged with reviewing student-athlete insurance coverage and business coverage for the Association.

The Executive Committee received a final report at its November meeting, approved several recommendations related to student-athlete insurance programs, the Association's portfolio of business insurance policies and contingency planning for Association events and forwarded them to the divisional governance structures for action specifically related to legislative changes.

As you know, each division reviews and approves its own budget. The Executive Committee has the responsibility and authority to review and approve the Association's overall budget. This fall, the Executive Committee approved an overall operating budget of over \$422,233,000 for the coming year, which represents an increase of more than \$75 million over the 2000-02 budget. The increase can be attributed primarily to increased television and marketing rights since this is the first year of the Association's new bundled-rights agreements with CBS and ESPN.

In August 2002, following a lengthy review to evaluate the long-term viability of the NCAA Foundation, the Executive Committee approved a recommendation from the Foundation Board to dissolve the NCAA Foundation and distribute its assets to the NCAA with the commitment that the leadership and scholarship programs continue.

The Foundation Board was re-established as a Leadership Advisory Board that reports to the NCAA president. The Leadership Advisory Board comprises corporate leaders and current and former student-athletes who provide broad-based advice and counsel to the NCAA president and contribute at least \$10,000 annually to the NCAA to support leadership and scholarship programs.

Last year, I reported on the work of the NCAA Ad Hoc Review Committee, appointed two years ago by the Executive Committee, to obtain membership feedback to help guide the future of the Association. In August, the Executive Committee reviewed the Ad Hoc Review Committee's report along with a prioritized list of issues provided by the governance structures in all three divisions.

There was great significance from the ad hoc report. The committee noted:

- The membership believes the governance structure has achieved greater CEO control and greater divisional autonomy. However, CEO involvement throughout intercollegiate athletics remains discouragingly low.
- Federation and divisional autonomy have resulted in positive outcomes for each division.
- There is agreement that having the national office and conference center in Indianapolis has provided greater opportunity for interaction between the membership and staff.
- The most valued principles for the Association are: student-athlete welfare, academic standards and institutional control.
- The membership believes that staff plays an appropriate role in identifying and framing issues. However, non-presidential constituencies are less comfortable with the increased role of staff leadership.
- Members prefer information through e-mail and memoranda, and The NCAA News continues to be an important source of information.
- Based on the report results and feedback, the committee voted to articulate its priorities to the new NCAA president. In particular, the committee recommended a more focused agenda to address critical issues and that the governance structures present a set of recommendations to the Executive Committee for action in April 2003.

The recommendations should include: (1) ways to strengthen the NCAA Convention; (2)

ways to continue to advocate for equal opportunity for minority and female constituents in intercollegiate athletics; (3) initiatives designed to improve communications in education, and build support among various constituent groups; and (4) options to improve the effectiveness of the Executive Committee to reflect membership interests that span all divisions.

The ad hoc report was distributed to the membership in June and is also available on the NCAA Web site.

I remain excited about this opportunity to address critical Association-wide and governance structure issues. On behalf of my CEO colleagues on the Executive Committee, I would like to thank all who participated in this critical review process.

In November, the Executive Committee endorsed a recommendation by its Subcommittee on Gender and Diversity Issues that a comprehensive report on American Indian mascot issues developed by the NCAA Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee be referred to the governance structure. The comprehensive report culminated 18 months of study. The report acknowledges that institutions currently using American Indian mascots, nicknames and symbols ought to do so as part of an honored and revered college tradition established to recognize noble qualities of American Indian people and their culture, such as courage, dignity, strength and loyalty.

However, in acknowledgement of today's diverse society, the global expansion of higher education and an NCAA Constitution that supports the honor and dignity of all persons, the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee believes when American Indians are used as a mascot, harmful stereotypes may result. The report outlines specific recommendations for institutions, conferences and the NCAA to conduct self-analyses of whether such mascot usage can be viewed as offensive. The report also states that institutions that currently use American Indian mascots should be given an opportunity to provide input on this matter. The Executive Committee accepted the report, noting that this issue is a concern to the NCAA. However, the Executive Committee noted that several of the recommendations require additional evaluation from various NCAA constituents and the Executive Committee expects to take formal action on this issue in April.

Also in November, the Executive Committee heard a report on the Secretary of Education's Commission on Opportunity and Athletics. The Committee emphasized its continued desire for Association involvement and requested that NCAA President Cedric Dempsey address the commission at its November meeting, which did occur.

The Committee also reinforced its position that the Association support Title IX, identify accomplishments related to the law and clarify misinformation and misconceptions that the commission had heard to that point.

Another responsibility of the Executive Committee is to monitor the litigation in which the Association is involved. I am pleased to report that for the second year in a row the number of active cases against the Association is down. During the past year, the Association has had continued success in defending its policies in court.

Memorial Tribute

Mr. Lawless: As has been the tradition during the opening business session, the NCAA will honor athletics staff members and student-athletes who died during this past year with a memorial resolutions report. The method of honoring those individuals will change slightly beginning with this opening business session. The NCAA is recognizing individuals who have died by listing their names in the NCAA Convention Program along with a general recognition and observance of a moment of silence.

In November, a communication was forwarded to all directors of athletics and conference commissioners notifying them of this change and providing an electronic link to the NCAA

Web site for the submission of names of individuals from an institution or conference who died in 2002. The NCAA News will continue to publish notification of deaths in each issue. I also would like to acknowledge the substantial and valuable assistance we have received from Sharon Tufano and Leilana McKindra, the NCAA staff members assigned the duties of compiling the list.

At this time, please turn to Pages 24-26 in your Convention Program to view the names of 124 staff members associated with athletics and 53 student-athletes who died in 2002. I ask delegates, visitors and our friends in the news media to please stand and observe a moment of silence for those men and women who have passed away since we last met.

[Note: The assembly observed a moment of silence.]

Mr. Lawless: Thank you. If you know of persons who should be added to the list, please contact Sharon Tufano or any member of the NCAA staff. Thank you.

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

Mr. Lawless: Now, it is my pleasure to introduce our president, Myles Brand, to present our state of the Association address. Myles Brand is a scholar, philosopher, educator and administrator. He was selected October 10 as the NCAA's fourth chief executive officer and began his new responsibilities January 1. Prior to joining the NCAA, Brand had been president of Indiana University, a position he held since 1994. Throughout his tenure at IU and other institutions, Brand focused on providing wide access to higher education; urging his staff and colleagues in the realm of higher education to be personally and fiscally accountable for enhancing the economic, social and cultural development of the communities they work and live in.

Brand has served on a number of boards, including those of national higher education associations. He chaired the Big Ten Council of Presidents/Chancellors and is the outgoing chairman of the Board of the American Association of Universities. President Brand serves as chairman of the Indiana Conference on Higher Education and as a board member of the National Association of State and Land Grant Universities. He is also a member of the board of directors of the University Corporation for Advanced Internet Development.

President Brand is married to Dr. Peg Brand, an artist and professor of philosophy and gender studies at Indiana University. Please join me in welcoming President Myles Brand. (Applause)

Mr. Brand: I am pleased to be with you today as the new president of the NCAA. I am—as we all are—fortunate to follow in the footsteps of those who have ably led the Association in the past. Walter Byers set the course for the modern era, and we will reap the benefits of his vision for years to come. Dick Schultz, the second person to hold this office, helped demystify the Association and move us forward. We will continue to build on past successes and rely on the strong vision of Cedric Dempsey that has guided the Association through a period of dramatic change and growth.

Ced, in fact, has made my job both easier and more difficult. My job is easier because Ced leaves the NCAA in excellent financial condition, staffed with outstanding, dedicated persons and on track for future achievements. My job is more difficult because Ced has set the bar high—very high—for performance. We have all gained much from his leadership of intercollegiate athletics and from his deep integrity and commitment to the NCAA.

My task today is daunting. I am to deliver the president's address to the annual Convention, having been in my role for less than two weeks. So, it should come as no surprise when I say that my major goal for the next several months is to listen and learn. I am aware that I must find ways to tap into a great store of accumulated wisdom. Good and thoughtful people have considered and debated the issues facing intercollegiate athletics today. Many of these folks have already offered me good counsel. I intend to meet and talk

with many more in the near future. And there is a mountain of information—from data to reports to opinion pieces—with which I need to become acquainted. I look forward to this task with the excitement and energy of a newly enrolled student. I am eager to learn from all of you and others who labor in the fields of intercollegiate athletics on a daily basis.

But please do not misunderstand. Even though I have much to learn, my mind is not a blank slate. As a university president for almost 15 years, I have been engaged in the administration and oversight of intercollegiate athletics. My views are not cut in limestone, as we say in Indiana. They are certainly open to revision and change. There are areas about which I have everything to learn. But I start this effort with an overall perspective and with some clear guiding principles in mind. I will begin to outline these for you today.

First, let me offer a comment or two about the context in which we all live, work and compete. These are challenging times for intercollegiate athletics. Difficult issues abound. These issues have determinant influences on the lives of student-athletes, the universities and the colleges they attend, and the NCAA itself. The difficulties are exacerbated by the intense interest of our publics and constituencies, which are made highly visible by an active press. The recent response to these challenges has been, I am pleased to say, the beginning of a serious reform movement.

We have a new reform focus for student-athletes. We are making progress, for example, in Division I through the recent passage of strengthened academic standards. Divisions II and III are also aggressively attacking these issues and should be applauded for their leadership. But much work remains to be completed. Our reform goal should be enhancing the academic and developmental environment necessary for the full success of student-athletes. In the end, it is all about the student-athlete.

The reform movement also should address issues pertaining directly to the financial challenges universities and colleges face. How do we manage the growth associated with athletics? How do we address issues pertaining to our external constituents, such as gaining a better understanding of the degree of commercial activity that is compatible with maintaining the integrity of college sports? And how do we deal with the over-enthusiasm of our fans, most especially those students and others whose celebrations turn unruly?

The growing reform movement focuses on the challenges facing intercollegiate athletics. But we should not become so absorbed in these programs that we lose sight of our purposes, which is to reinforce the positive value of intercollegiate athletics, to advocate for the benefits intercollegiate athletics provide young women and men and the universities and colleges they attend. We should encourage—and advocate for—the spirit and excitement of intercollegiate athletics.

We must be clear that reform and advocacy are not merely compatible, they are mutually supporting. We must undertake both, and we must do so simultaneously. Without genuine reform, the future of intercollegiate athletics is in peril. Without vigorous advocacy, the value of intercollegiate athletics will be unrealized.

Reform and advocacy are the dual guideposts to our future success. They are, to borrow from an old Chinese proverb, the two legs on which we will march forward. The NCAA should position itself so that the future of intercollegiate athletics benefits from both serious reform and strong advocacy. Each step toward this future will require your support.

Knowing the dual guideposts, however, does not guarantee that we will reach our destination. The devil will be in the details. We must adopt specific reforms that achieve the desired results without harmful unintended consequences. The process used to develop these reforms must rely on acceptance by the affected constituencies. This is critical. If we fail to approach the process carefully, misunderstanding, lack of commitment and lack of ownership of these much-needed reforms will be the result of our inattention.

Let me illustrate. It has become clear to many, myself included, that meaningful and

lasting academic reform requires that a system of incentives and disincentives be put into place. In Division I, the conversation has mostly focused on disincentives for poor academic performance on both the individual and team levels, such as the loss of scholarships or the inability to compete in postseason and championship play. There has been some, but not a great deal of parallel discussion of incentives for excellent academic performance. Positive reinforcement can be a powerful tool in encouraging coaches and universities to enhance academic performance and graduation. It is my belief that the final package should include both strong disincentives and strong incentives.

But before adopting any incentive/disincentive package, we must engage in extensive consultation, data collection and analysis. For example, the current federally mandated method of collecting graduation rates at the six-year mark for each class results in dated and misleading data. The process unfairly penalizes programs where student-athletes leave in good academic standing or where incoming transfers graduate within an appropriate period of time. A more timely approach to calculating academic progress, say annually, would provide more useful information on student-athlete progress and better understanding of the academic status of those who leave a program.

Our decision-making must be based on evidence, rather than intuition or anecdote. It must be inclusive and ensure that all key stakeholders have the opportunity to have their perspective heard and their supporting data presented. Fortunately, our colleges and universities have knowledgeable staff and faculty who can provide expert analysis. But in the end, it is the responsibility of the presidents and chancellors to make the final decisions. Of course, the NCAA has the responsibility of organizing itself so that good, timely, inclusive and evidence-based decision-making occurs. To the extent that current procedures are overly bureaucratic or exclude key stakeholders, we will have to modify our processes.

One point requires additional emphasis. The NCAA is a membership organization, consisting of more than 1,200 universities, colleges and related associations. It is the members, represented ultimately by university and college presidents, who decide on future courses of action. While we recognize that final authority resides with our members, the NCAA—including the president of the Association—has a leadership role to play. I intend to provide direction by drawing attention to the dual guideposts of reform and advocacy and by engaging the Association and its membership in developing approaches and undertaking actions that are demarcated by these guideposts.

Within the next year, I will work with the NCAA membership to develop a strategic planning process designed to enable progress in the area of reform and advocacy. The strategic directions that emerge from this planning process will position the Association and its members to advance the positive roles that intercollegiate athletics play, while resolving, as much as possible, the outstanding problems. My goal is to substantially complete this process before this time next year.

I envision a strategic plan that builds on the good work already undertaken by the NCAA and other organizations and individuals. Divisions II and III, for example, already have developed plans for strategic initiatives that support a broader plan. As we undertake this process, we must assure key stakeholders that their perspectives will be taken into consideration. The plan must achieve the right level of abstraction—it cannot be so specific that it pre-empts presidential decision-making, nor can it be so general that it devolves into platitudes. Most importantly, this strategic plan must be value-based. The future directions of intercollegiate athletics must reflect our positive values.

This is an appropriate moment for us to look into the future. The problems for intercollegiate athletics have become glaringly obvious, and the reform movement has begun. The environment for intercollegiate athletics, like everything else in the world around us, is changing rapidly. But we can rest assured on one truth: Those who do not plan for the future are destined to be victimized by it.

The pace of change is accelerating as new technologies dramatically affect every aspect of our lives. The prospects for better health and longevity are coupled with growing anxiety about the human condition and the depletion of natural resources. Communication technologies have brought us closer and enabled fans to view sports 24 hours a day. At the same time, the shortened news cycle and multitude of new media outlets have made news broadcasting less reliable, while encouraging outrageous online, on-air and in-person behavior in an effort to compete for audience share.

Former President Jimmy Carter, who recently was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, noted in his inaugural address that we must “adapt to changing times, while holding fast to unchanging principles.” As we follow the dual guideposts of reform and advocacy through a rapidly changing world, we must do so in a principled manner. Let me try to articulate several key principles that should underlie any adequate strategic plan for reform and advocacy in college sports.

I take as my first principle the conviction that intercollegiate athletics must be integrated into the academic mission of colleges and universities. Athletic competition is a vital part of American higher education, but it cannot stand alone nor should it only minimally fulfill the primary mission of our colleges and universities. Rather, it must go hand in hand with their academic goals.

This means that we must support student-athletes’ academic success by ensuring that they have access to the full range of major courses of study and by developing sound initial-and continuing-eligibility standards that provide incentives for success. We must remember that student-athletes are just that: student-athletes. We must not allow their athletic training and competition to overwhelm their educational opportunities. Their commitment to their sport and their regimen for athletics preparedness should permit adequate time for study and a social life. There is nothing more important to higher education, in my view, than educational opportunities for students. I understand not every student will avail himself or herself of these opportunities; but it is our job to ensure that all student-athletes train and compete in environments that encourage them to do so.

This principle also implies that intercollegiate athletics is organized and administered on campus in such a way that it supports the academic goals of the institution. Competitive individual and team performance is a high priority, no doubt, but not at the cost of student-athletes’ academic success. Athletics programs are part of the university, and they should function in much the same way as other campus units. Intercollegiate athletics, especially in the high-profile sports, commands a great deal of attention on and off campus. Despite this intense interest, we should not lose sight of our priorities. Intercollegiate athletics must accommodate itself to the academic priorities of universities and colleges, and not vice versa.

We cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that presidential control of intercollegiate athletics is essential. I present this as our second principle. The Knight Commission served intercollegiate athletics well when, in its first report published in 1991, it clearly articulated this pragmatic truth. University and college presidents are in the best position to provide institutional leadership, while taking into account the perspectives of student-athletes, coaches, fans, faculty members and governing boards.

This principle of presidential control is the essential feature of the reform movement. Though critics and pundits, external commissions and study committees may hope to influence the future course of intercollegiate athletics, the fact of the matter is that presidents are best positioned to change their campus’ perspectives and behavior. When missteps in athletic programs occur, universities are open to criticism, and the presidents are the ones on the front lines. I know because I have been there. It is presidents who have the ultimate responsibility for setting standards and ensuring that these standards are followed. The

NCAA should make every possible effort to assist presidents in carrying out these responsibilities.

These two principles speak to the reform initiatives underway. The next two pertain to advocacy.

I present as our third guiding principle my conviction that the positive value of intercollegiate athletics should be stressed and reinforced. You will not find this stated so plainly among the principles and rules set forth in the NCAA Manual, but it is one central purpose for which the NCAA exists.

Yet, we tend to emphasize the problems that accompany intercollegiate athletics. The media—and often we ourselves—focus attention on the student-athlete's or coach's personal shortcomings, inappropriate actions, or on the current crisis of the day. These are real issues, of course; and they should not be neglected. But we do ourselves and intercollegiate athletics a considerable disservice if we allow these problems to become overwhelming pre-occupations. Such preoccupations can make us miss the good in intercollegiate sports and forget the reason why we are all here. Let us not permit our natural impulse to attend to problems and failures to hijack college sports.

Athletics provides unique opportunities for young women and men to internalize the values of hard work, fair competition and cooperation toward a common goal. Intercollegiate athletics develops the virtues of loyalty, fairness, self-respect, respect for others and a quest for excellence. Undertaken in the right spirit, college sports promotes a sense of community and good citizenship. And with more than 150,000 women participating today, and in greater numbers in the future, the positive value of intercollegiate athletics reaches even farther.

Intercollegiate athletics provides extraordinary opportunities for alumni, donors and campus friends to feel vitally connected to the life of the university. Only the most cynical can resist being moved by the thrill of victory. Last year as I watched the Indiana Hoosiers' exciting run to the championship game, I was filled with great excitement and pride. Even distant fans can catch the spirit vicariously. There are good reasons why intercollegiate athletics has become incredibly popular.

The NCAA and its members should reinforce and emphasize the positive value of college sports. Let us freely admit and loudly proclaim that intercollegiate athletics has significant value. We should fix the problems, but we should not let them cast a pall over college sports.

I advance as our fourth guiding principle the idea that the integrity of intercollegiate athletics is and must remain paramount. College sports have their own unique identity. They are different from professional sports. Professional sports have much to offer their fans and host cities; they, too, have value. But college athletics are distinct from professional sports, and the uniqueness of college sports should be preserved and nurtured.

Even in collegiate sports where attendance is small, student-athletes compete hard for themselves, their teammates and their schools. These athletes are amateurs in the sense of the term most often understood by the general public. The sense of the game for its own value, the feeling of pride in the competition itself, the recognition for local champions, all contribute to the unique integrity of intercollegiate athletics.

But the integrity of college sports is apparent, too, in high-profile Division I-A football and men's basketball. Not much can compare to the sense of camaraderie apparent on a Saturday afternoon in a stadium where more than 100,000 fans dressed in their school colors cheer their alma mater to victory. Popular college sports attract fans nationwide, indeed worldwide. Though such sporting events bear some similarities to professional games, including sponsored broadcasts, they nonetheless retain their integrity. While it is difficult to describe, the felt experience of college and professional sports are simply not the same.

I am not revealing any secrets when I note that a primary threat to the integrity of col-

lege sports is over-commercialization. There are those who see little, if any, advantage to maintaining the integrity of college sports, and who push for unlimited, unrestrained commercialization. The problem is that much of the extraordinary value of intercollegiate athletics depends on its integrity, and that is lost when commercial interests overwhelm the game.

There are others who believe the integrity of college sports has already been lost to unrestrained commercialism. On the contrary, I believe there is a proper role for commercial sponsorship and partnership with intercollegiate athletics. Those who proclaim that commercial interests have no place in intercollegiate athletics have a myopic view of the nature of the modern university. Universities, both private and public, cannot achieve excellence, including paying competitive faculty salaries and constructing necessary academic facilities, without individual and corporate support. For instance, business buildings are filled with plaques lauding corporate sponsorship; classical music schools seek corporate support for performances. Athletics programs, likewise, need corporate support to succeed. The irony is palpable when those who declare that university athletics programs—unlike business and music programs—should be self-supporting and should reject corporate funds.

If athletics events are presented in the right way, even large-scale corporate agreements do not put the integrity of intercollegiate sports at risk. An excellent example is the CBS/ESPN contracts with the NCAA, which include our basketball tournaments. This partnership permits wide media access for fans, while highlighting the excitement and promoting the best features of college sports.

Admittedly, there are no ironclad, specific criteria for judging when commercial interests overwhelm college sports. Smart people of goodwill can disagree on this point. For me, the judgment depends on whether the integrity of college sports is sustained or jeopardized. Good common sense and an open, unbiased perspective should be the tools by which we measure appropriate commercial involvement.

The final principle to which I want to call attention concerns fair and just action in intercollegiate athletics. So I present as our fifth guiding principle the proposition that the norms of ethical behavior must guide all of intercollegiate athletics.

Fairness and ethical behavior are required—not merely preferred—in intercollegiate athletics. That pertains, for example, to the way coaches treat student-athletes, the way student-athletes treat each other, to the way universities deal with student-athletes, and to the way the NCAA interacts with everyone. The golden rule, which we all learned as children, is at the heart of the matter: treat others as you would have them treat you. No doubt, this sounds old-fashioned to some. But morality is timeless. To repeat President Carter's point, in changing times, we must adhere to unchanging principles.

Student-athletes have obligations to others and also to themselves. They are to follow the moral and legal norms of their communities. That includes, among other guidelines, respectful treatment of others. It includes, too, no drug or alcohol abuse, and no gambling. Along with the NCAA, universities should set standards and every coach should reinforce good student behavior. But, in the end, student-athletes must take personal responsibility for their own actions. We should not expect less of them, and they should not expect less of themselves.

Fairness also is an issue in the formation and enforcement of NCAA rules. New rules should not treat unfairly any student-athlete or any university. Enforcement must be consistent and must be applied equally. But with regard to enforcement and rule violation, there should also be a place for good judgment. Fairness permits consideration of context.

One of the most important pieces of legislation affecting higher education in the last half of the 20th century is Title IX. It opened doors for young women to participate in intercollegiate athletics in ways and in numbers never before achieved. I am a strong advocate and

supporter of Title IX. I am pleased that young women—including my two young granddaughters—will have the chance to experience firsthand the positive value of intercollegiate athletics.

I am, of course, aware that some persons are unhappy with the Department of Education's current interpretations of the rules for implementing Title IX. The presidential commission appointed by Secretary Paige may shed light on this interpretation, and we await the commission's report. But we must move forward in fully implementing Title IX in a timely and aggressive manner, despite the discomfort of some individuals or institutions.

The end result must be an equal chance for women and men to participate in intercollegiate athletics. We must become more creative in how we gather and use resources to ensure that everyone who wants to participate has the opportunity to do so, and our focus should be directed toward opportunity-based results. No one should be left out because of gender.

This principle of ethical behavior also pertains to access to leadership positions for women and minority men. One of the most egregious instances of this lack of access is the low number of African-American head football coaches and offensive and defensive coordinators in Division I-A. The current situation is simply unjustifiable. As my predecessor Ced Dempsey has done, I will work with the key constituency organizations as well as the universities that do the hiring to change current practices. Another, and related issue, concerns access to AD and other athletic department leadership positions for minorities and women. We should not accept excuses for lack of success in these matters.

For a speech that started with the disclaimer that I have been on the job for less than two weeks and that I plan to listen and learn, I seem to have said a lot. But recall my also mentioning that, though I have much to learn, I do not enter the fray with a blank slate.

The dual objectives of reform and advocacy will be my guideposts. I intend to lead the NCAA by working with its members to bring to fruition the reform movement now underway. There is much work to be done in resolving the outstanding problems confronting college sports—problems that threaten our entire enterprise if we leave them unsolved. But problem solving is not enough. We must also reinforce and emphasize the positive value of intercollegiate athletics. Undertaken in the right way and with the right spirit, intercollegiate athletics offer extraordinary opportunities for young women and men. We need to celebrate the joy and excitement of college sports, and the contributions they make to our culture.

In order to march down the road on the two legs of reform and advocacy, we need a roadmap. That map is the strategic plan. Through an inclusive, timely, value-driven process, I propose we develop strategic directions that will lead to our goals.

This strategic plan will be shaped in great part by several fundamental principles. These principles include ones pertaining to reform, namely, the full integration of intercollegiate athletics into the academic mission of universities and colleges, and campus and national control of athletics by the presidents. They also include principles for advocacy; that is, an emphasis on the positive value of intercollegiate athletics and the recognition and preservation of the integrity of college sports. Crucial, too, is a firm commitment to ethical behavior, including advocacy for full participation by women athletes, and minorities and women in leadership positions.

This agenda is admittedly large. But we reach high goals only by first aiming high. Commenting on this new book, "In Search of America," newscaster Peter Jennings recently noted that America is a great nation in part because it is "always in the act of becoming, often falling short of its ambitions, yet always ready to resume." As a great American institution, intercollegiate athletics, too, is always in the act of becoming. Sometimes, we fall short of our ambitions, but we must always be prepared to resume the full pursuit of them.

You can count on my commitment to these goals. You can count, too, on my energetic and aggressive engagement in pursuing them.

I am, however, smart enough to know that reaching these goals is not possible working alone. Reform and advocacy are team sports. I sincerely ask that we join together in this effort. Together, I am confident we can scale any heights.

Thank you.

Mr. Lawless: Thank you, Dr. Brand, for your insightful comments, which provide us with issues, challenges and direction. On behalf of the entire Association, I would like to thank you for accepting the challenge to become the fourth chief executive officer of the NCAA. We are excited about the future of the NCAA and for the opportunity to work with you. (Applause)

Earlier today, I introduced those individuals who have been providing leadership in the three divisions during the past year. We are fortunate that Bob Hemenway will continue to serve as chair of the Division I Board of Directors for another year. However, Division II and Division III will have new leadership in 2003. I would like to commend outgoing chairs Patricia Cormier and Bette Landman for their leadership to the Association during their four-year tenure on the Divisions II and III Presidents Councils. Among their many duties as chairs this past year, these two colleagues joined me in serving on the presidential search committee. Their commitment of time, personal insight, candor and vision made the process and task credible and enjoyable. Based on their enthusiasm and energy exhibited, I am sure that they will continue to remain involved in Association activities. I ask you to please join me in thanking Presidents Cormier, Hemenway and Landman for their service. (Applause)

Please don't forget we have our Honors Dinner tonight, which will be at 7:30 in the exhibit hall at the Disneyland Hotel. Please be reminded that tickets for this year's event will be collected at the door, and you will need your ticket to enter the dinner. Also, please refer to the Convention schedule for details regarding your divisional business sessions and forums.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your attention. Enjoy the Convention and your time in Anaheim. This session is adjourned.

[The opening business session was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.]

NCAA Honors Dinner

January 12, 2003

The 38th annual NCAA Honors Dinner was called to order at 7:30 p.m., with Robert Lawless, chair of the NCAA Executive Committee and president of the University of Tulsa, presiding.

Public Address Audiotape: Today's Top VIII honorees: Ann Marie Brooks, the University of Missouri; Michelle Cottrell, Northern Kentucky University; Kari Groshek, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point; Ryan Johnson, Montana State University; Stacy Nuveman, University of California, Los Angeles; Andree Pickens, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; and Aly Wagner, Santa Clara University.

The Silver Anniversary Honorees: Debbie Brown, University of Southern California; Ann Meyers Drysdale, University of California, Los Angeles; Dale Kramer, Carleton College; Dr. Kenneth MacAfee, University of Notre Dame; Harold Warren Moon, University of Washington; and Gifford Nielsen, Brigham Young University.

Inspiration Award honorees: Diane Geppi-Aikens, Loyola College; Amanda Walton, Yale University; and Todd Williams, Florida State University.

The 2003 Theodore Roosevelt Award honoree, Donna de Varona, University of California, Los Angeles.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome Dr. Bob Lawless, chair of the NCAA Executive Committee and president of the University of Tulsa. (Applause)

Mr. Lawless: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the 38th annual NCAA Honors Dinner. As we gather together tonight in a place known for its magic, you will find that the ones who truly create magic every day are the honorees you see before you tonight. Their victories on the field are no more important to them as the victories that they help others achieve, and that is what makes them true champions. Each of our honorees has a story to tell, an inspiration to bring to others. Tonight, we will honor each of them with a tribute. Tonight is truly a night of celebration. I think this night defines the NCAA more so than any other event. We think about the Final Four, we think about other competitions, and we think from time to time that the NCAA means enforcement. What the NCAA really means is success—success of students, success in making the difference in the lives of others. So tonight, we will celebrate, but before we begin the celebration, I invite each of you to enjoy dinner and the company of those seated around you. We will be back shortly after dinner—you don't have to rush—to honor tonight's very special guests. Enjoy the dinner.

Public Address Annoucer: Ladies and gentlemen, again please welcome the 2003 NCAA Honors Dinner honorees, the NCAA Today's Top VIII, Silver Anniversary and Inspiration Award honorees; and the 2003 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner. (Applause)

Audiovisual Recording: These are the faces of champions. Champions not defined only by the victories on the field, but by the victories in their pursuit of excellence in life. Their triumphs in the classroom are as celebrated as their triumphs in their sport. They have lent a hand to those who were in need; they have spoken for others whose voice could not be heard.

They have faced personal battles with dignity and a winning spirit. They define what it means to be a champion. They embody the spirit of athletics. They embody the spirit of the NCAA. Welcome to the 2003 NCAA Honors Dinner. (Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome back Dr. Lawless.

Opening Remarks

Mr. Lawless: Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, we have before us 17 amazing individuals. Each has had victories in their sports, but it is more than just this that binds them together. They define victory in terms of what they can do for others. They define teamwork as what can be accomplished with a common goal. They define success when someone they have helped succeeds. An obstacle in their path is something to conquer, not something that holds them back.

Tonight, we will meet newly graduated or senior student-athletes with the Today's Top VIII Awards. We will then introduce you to the former student-athletes who continue to promote athleticism through their civic and professional lives. Also, tonight, for only the second year, we will award the NCAA's Inspiration Award. The Inspiration Award is presented tonight to three incredible people who were faced with seemingly insurmountable challenges. They each had to call upon their fighting spirit inside themselves to conquer a personal battle. As you will hear, their stories are ones of hope and inspiration. Finally, we will have the honor of meeting the 36th recipient of the NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award, or the Teddy Award.

But before we begin, I would like to introduce a man who just 12 days ago officially became the NCAA's fourth CEO. As a former educator and as president of Indiana University for the past eight years, his experience and leadership will help propel the NCAA to new heights in both academic and athletic endeavors. Please join me in welcoming the president of the NCAA, Dr. Myles Brand. (Applause)

I would also like to introduce to you a group of people who have a difficult task—the members of the NCAA Honors Committee. They had to select tonight's honorees and plan tonight's program. Will each of you stand as I call your name and remain standing until I have named the entire committee so we can applaud your efforts and your success? Beginning with the committee chair, Valerie Richardson, assistant commissioner of the West Coast Conference; Harry Carson, president of Harry Carson, Incorporated; Eugene Corrigan, commissioner emeritus, Atlantic Coast Conference; Clyde Doughty, Jr., athletics director, New York Institute of Technology; Jo Ann Harper, athletics director, Dartmouth College; Susan Hartmann, faculty athletics representative, Ohio State University; Karen Johnson, director of institutional research, Alfred University. Although he's not able to be here tonight, Jack Ford, ESPN news anchor and correspondent also is on the committee. Ladies and gentlemen, the NCAA Honors Committee. (Applause)

Introduction of Master of Ceremonies

Mr. Lawless: Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, our master of ceremonies has gone one on one with almost every professional sports league in the nation, and that's all in a day's work. As an anchor for ESPN SportsCenter, her straightforward style and humor has made fans around the globe. She began her career at a New York radio station when few women were breaking into sports reporting. But it didn't take long for the nation to realize that she was nothing short of spectacular. In 1987, she became the first full-time female sports anchor on a national radio network and tonight Linda Cohn lends us her talents to help honor our NCAA award winners.

Audiovisual Recording: Whether it's on a hockey rink, basketball court or race track, Linda Cohn is the "go-to" gal. During the last decade, Linda has been a major player at ESPN, as a SportsCenter anchor. Just give her a microphone, and she will go head-to-head with the giants of the NFL, PGA or major league baseball, all without breaking a sweat.

Linda not only talks the talk, she also walks the walk. She started her sports career as

the goalie of her high-school boy's ice hockey team before bringing her talents to the ice at the State University College at Oswego, proving whether it's playing or reporting, Linda has got game.

Mr. Lawless: Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to welcome tonight's emcee, Linda Cohn. (Applause)

Ms. Cohn: How is it going, everybody? Are we excited? (Applause) I am glad to be here, but before we talk about my run-in with Goofy and Mickey today, because it was an incident that you didn't hear about, I want to talk about Bob Lawless and what he brings to the table. I wish I would have known I would be sitting at his table. He is a very funny man. He doesn't appear to come out in situations like this, but I will tell you he had me on the floor laughing. But seriously, the reason I bring up Bob, and I am running with Goofy, is the fact that his two-year term as chair of the NCAA Executive Committee is coming to an end.

His leadership has served the Association for more than 10 years. His extensive contributions will have long-lasting impact on the Association and its student-athletes. Before we talk about anything regarding ourselves and this wonderful group, I just want to have you give a hand to what Dr. Bob Lawless has done. Give him a hand. He deserves it. Thank you. (Applause)

You know, this event for me started off with a bang. I grew up in New York, as you can tell and will begin to tell from my accent, which is very thick. I don't have that much on TV. I woke up this morning and I go to work out. I am wearing my very shocking T-shirt trying to get over last week's debacle against the 49ers, which will take a long time. I walk in and get going and I have somebody else who is on the treadmill running. This is Disneyland. I say this is incredible. Then I recognize who it was. It was none other than the guy I always root for, none other than Harry Carson, of course.

The NCAA is an incredible group. I mean, can you imagine the mountain of challenges, the obstacles they go through to get here? It is really incredible. I look back on my career, and I think about the obstacles I faced. Perhaps the biggest obstacle I faced was putting on 40 pounds of goalie equipment in the ladies room. It wasn't easy. I am dating myself because they didn't have a laundry room for me when I played on the men's high school hockey team. That was a challenge. That just shows you that was nothing compared to what this group has done. So that is really incredible.

I love the fact that there is not a better place to have this event than Disneyland. It is the happiest place on earth, right? It is neat. I mean, you are lying to me if you have not been chanting in your head all day some kind of Disney tune. It is like I am humming or whistling while I work. It is just non-stop. I saw the theme of the mermaid when I came in. To me, it is really a perfect place. Don't worry, I am not going to break into some song—"Wish Upon A Star"—although it would fit, wouldn't it? Didn't a dream come true for all of these people, all these amazing student-athletes and the inspirational award winners? So it is perfect.

Throughout my career and with my association in athletics I have a definition of what makes a true champion. It is not stats, it is not records, it is not rank. No, it is not a big mouth, it is not a cool touchdown dance, and it is not appearances on SportsCenter. That is not what makes a true champion. It is what that student-athlete brings to the table—not only brings to the field, but what kind of teammate he or she is. That is what is important. It is what the student-athlete does when the camera and the microphones are off. That is what is important.

What kind of leader is he or she? That is what is important. It is knowing when a little can mean a lot. Volunteering for charity work and doing school work. That is what makes a true champion. I have a feeling that this group, these people, were not meant to just fit in. They were meant to stand out.

As we continue on this evening, I want to keep up the flow, because flow is important. I

would like to introduce you to today's Top VIII Award winners, the Silver Anniversary Award honorees and then present a special award—the second time that we are doing this—the Inspiration Award. Finally, we will meet the 2003 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner. They are Olympians, professional basketball players, gymnasts, volunteers for the arts, rising stars and inspirations to us all. It is my honor to share their story with you tonight.

Today, there are more than 360,000 student-athletes at the NCAA level. Let me begin tonight by introducing our elite eight outstanding student-athletes in the nation, who have the distinction of being the NCAA Today's Top VIII Award winners.

Audiovisual Message: When Ann Marie Brooks has on her running shoes, you won't be able to see the smile on her face. You will only see her back as she leads the pack. In fact, at the 2001 indoor national championships, she anchored her relay team and helped set the fastest indoor time in the world.

This four-time all-American, four-time Big 12 Conference champion, and five-time academic all-American ran just as hard to class as she did on the track. She graduated summa cum laude and received an NCAA postgraduate scholarship. She also ran for others who couldn't, helping the elderly and working with children with disabilities.

Her perfection in all tracks of life was recently recognized when she was named a 2002 NCAA Woman of the Year top-10 finalist. When it comes to perfection, Ann Marie Brooks is definitely on the right track.

Ms. Cohn: Ann Marie Brooks, the University of Missouri, posted a 4.01 grade-point average. Ann Marie is beyond perfection in the classroom, and that's exactly how she is when she laces up her running shoes. Ladies and gentlemen, Ann Marie Brooks. (Applause) Ann Marie will receive her Top VIII award tonight from Rick McGuire, head track and field coach at the University of Missouri. (Applause)

Our next honoree is Michelle Cottrell, Northern Kentucky University. In high school, Michelle played on many elite volleyball teams, including a Junior Olympic team. But when it came time to play in college, she traded her volleyball for a basketball. Why? Simply because she thought it was more fun, and she was right.

Audiovisual Message: When Michelle Cottrell chose basketball over volleyball, it was a slam dunk for the Norse of Northern Kentucky. She played the post with quiet killer instincts and a stadium full of family. Her dead-on shots advanced her team to three Elite Eight championships and the 2002 national crown—the first championship title in any sport for Northern Kentucky.

This three-time all-American racked up more than 2,000 points. And her awards are adding up just as quickly. She is the 2002 Kentucky NCAA woman-of-the-year state honoree and the Great Lakes Valley Conference female basketball scholar-athlete of the year.

As the university's most decorated women's basketball player, this NCAA postgraduate scholar will share her talents with children as a teacher and coach. One of her first lessons is sure to be that doing something fun can lead to great rewards.

Ms. Cohn: Ladies and gentlemen, Michelle Cottrell. Michelle will receive her Top VIII award from Nancy Winstel, head women's basketball coach at Northern Kentucky University. (Applause)

Next up is Kari Groshek, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point. When Kari walks on to a basketball court, what happens? She quickly becomes the center of attention.

Audiovisual Message: As the center for the Pointers of Wisconsin, Kari Groshek was the undisputed leader of the pack. Kari set a record of 38 points in a single game and finished her career posting more than 1,400 points. When it came to tournament time, Kari's moves on the court proved unstoppable, leading her team to the 2002 NCAA Division III Women's Basketball Championship title.

This Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference player of the year also scored big in

the classroom, receiving the Distinguished Achievement Award for a senior biology major. Today, when she is not on the court as a student assistant coach at her alma mater, she is at a nearby health facility working to become a physician's assistant.

But helping others is something Kari does naturally. As a senior in high school, Kari donated bone marrow to her younger brother who had been diagnosed with leukemia. Her selfless leadership truly puts Kari at the center of many hearts.

Ms. Cohn: Ladies and gentlemen, give it up for Kari Groshek. (Applause) Kari will receive her Top VIII award tonight from Shirley Egner, head women's basketball coach, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point. (Applause)

Next is Ryan Johnson, Montana State University. His football uniform is blue and gold, and gold is the best way to describe the man wearing it.

Audiovisual Message: When the Bobcats of Montana State needed to move the ball down the field, they looked to Ryan Johnson. His "catch-me-if-you-can" attitude and dominating force led to seven touchdowns this season and sent the Bobcats to their first playoff in 18 years. He ran past his opponents for a career total of more than 3,500 yards, breaking the Montana State career rushing record.

This 2001 Payton Trophy finalist also led others by serving as president of the campus Athletes in Action and campus Crusade for Christ. He led the pack in his studies as well. He was Verizon academic all-American of the year for Division I football in 2001 and graduated last month with a 3.99 GPA. His hands will soon be healing hands, giving others a golden touch through physical therapy, proving that even after football his hands still have the Midas touch.

Ms. Cohn: Ladies and gentlemen, Ryan Johnson. (Applause) Ryan will receive his Top VIII award from Geoffrey Gamble, president of Montana State University. (Applause)

Stacey Nuveman, University of California, Los Angeles. When Stacey broke the NCAA home run record, it was her dream come true. But it was the dream of another that she holds closest to her heart.

Audiovisual Message: With the crack of a bat, Stacey Nuveman smashed her way into the NCAA Division I softball record book. Finishing her career with a record-breaking 90 home runs, she also broke the NCAA single-season career slugging percentage record, leading the Bruins to the 2002 NCAA Women's College World Series.

This dream catcher was also a smashing success at the 2000 Olympic Games, hitting the game-winning, three-run homer against China in the bottom of the 10th, propelling Team USA toward gold. For one fan, meeting this four-time all-American, three-time Pac-10 player of the year, and U.S. national softball team member was a dream come true.

Jessica, a high-school softball catcher suffering from Hodgkin's disease, asked the Make-A-Wish Foundation to make her dream come true, to meet her hero, Stacey Nuveman. With gold medal in tow, Stacey spent the day with Jessica and the high-school softball team, proving that some of the greatest home runs are made off the diamond.

Ms. Cohn: Give Stacey a hand. (Applause) Stacey is receiving her award from Sue Enquist, head softball coach, University of California, Los Angeles. (Applause)

As you will note in your program tonight—this is a nice program by the way. Do you like it? I had nothing to do with it. (Laughter) Our next honoree selected for the Top VIII Award was to be Jonathan Stinchcomb from the University of Georgia. Unfortunately, John is unable to be with us tonight due to a last-minute conflict. But, without further delay, we will continue on and introduce you to our next amazing young student-athlete.

That brings us to Aly Wagner, Santa Clara University. When it came time for Aly to choose a university, she was recruited by some of the nation's top soccer powerhouses. But Aly didn't just want to play for a top team, she wanted to help create one.

Audiovisual Message: When Santa Clara came face-to-face with the defending national

champion and undefeated team of North Carolina at the 2001 NCAA College Cup, it was exactly the kind of match that Aly Wagner dreamed of, the David versus Goliath of the soccer championship.

It was the goal by Aly that toppled the giant and crowned Santa Clara as the new national champions. With expert dribbling and passes, Aly commands the field. This 2002 Hermann Trophy winner again led the Broncos to the 2002 championship game scoring the only Bronco goal.

When she is not passing on the field, she is passing in the classroom as an academic all-American with plans to graduate this spring. This soccer star also has a giant-sized heart, working with women and children at a local women's shelter. As a starter for the U.S. women's soccer national team, Aly's swift kick is sure to topple challengers on a world-wide scale.

Ms. Cohn: Ladies and gentlemen, Aly Wagner. (Applause) Aly will receive her Top VIII Award from Cheryl Levick, athletics director, Santa Clara University. (Applause) Congratulations, Aly.

Next is Andree Pickens, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. Andree suffered a potentially career-ending injury just days before the NCAA Gymnastics Championships her junior year. When she returned her senior year, she had a plan to get back on the road to the finals, and it was paved in crimson.

Audiovisual Message: She has the grace of a champion and the heart of a lion. In just her freshman year, Andree Pickens' graceful performance on the balance beam made her a national champion. Training for a return trip her junior year she tore her Achilles tendon and missed her chance for more gold.

But the injury didn't keep this high-flying gymnast down for long. She returned her senior year and added another individual national championship title on the uneven bars, and it was her fearless performance on the balance beam that clenched the national team title for the Crimson Tide.

But to this Alabama NCAA woman of the year state honoree, it is all about balance. When she is out of the gym, she is in the community reading to children and organizing clothing drives. Her determination to help others also follows her in the classroom. When she graduates this spring, Andree hopes to begin a new routine—medical school. And with her abundant grace and heart, she is sure to be a perfect 10.

Ms. Cohn: Ladies and gentlemen, Andree Pickens. (Applause) Andree will receive her Top VIII Award from Marie Robbins, senior woman administrator, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. (Applause)

Andree will now speak on behalf of the entire eight award recipients.

Response - Andree Pickens

Ms. Pickens: First, I would like to thank God, from whom all things are possible. I want to, on behalf of this year's Top VIII Award winners, thank the NCAA for this prestigious honor. I know that I speak for all of us on this stage when I say how amazing it is for us to be among the thousands of qualified athletes to receive this award. We thank you for honoring us.

I don't have to tell you I am impressed with these seven people. You have heard about their accomplishments, and they are extraordinary to have achieved all that they have. I must say I am humbled to represent them at this moment. Each of them is so smart, so talented, and having read their bios, it is obvious they are busy. The way they threw their lives into this is a true inspiration. I thank you for this great night in intercollegiate athletics. Not only do we have the chance to compete at the very top of our respective sport and test our-

selves to be the best of the best, we also have the opportunity to make a difference in the direction and the representation of our school.

More importantly, though, we have had the opportunity to help make a difference in the community. I am hopeful by doing that we not only make a difference for today, but maybe we can inspire someone else to make a difference tomorrow. The eight of us have gone far in accomplishments, but we are all blessed with a great deal of support along the way—our coaches, our teammates and the fans helped carry us through the good times and the bad times.

But it goes without saying, our fire started with our families. Would our family members present, please stand? (Applause) You are the people who started us on our way, who provided support for the foundation of our dreams. They were the ones who taught us not to be afraid and to reach however far, and that anything is possible with hard work and dedication. We are each traveling to our destination, and we thank you.

I hope that we have shown you that is the right path to take, not only in athletics, but in our life. I hope the next generation aspire as well and shall be leaders in their own right. I hope that we have shown the next generation to be humble. We thank God for the many things He has bestowed upon us. The kids of today take from what we have accomplished and they understand that these eight people here tonight are not just here because of what they did, but because of how they did it—by hard work. If they realize that they are accomplishing a dream, you have to be willing to sacrifice—not just be a great individual, but to be a great human being. If they understand that everything we have accomplished and all that it takes to get here tonight, it has certainly been worth it. I would like to say thank you for honoring us and being here tonight. Enjoy the rest of your evening. (Applause)

Ms. Cohn: Andree, I just want to point this out. Besides those wonderful awards they get, they also get to take home their chairs. Bob, do they get to take home the chairs? They say it is okay. They are beautiful. How about a chair for me? Can I take it home? (Laughter)

I have to show the kids something. You can't get enough Mickey and Minnie stuff, but the chair would be nice.

I speak from experience growing up doing sports, I would not be the competitor I am if it wasn't for sports. I wouldn't even have been an athlete if it wasn't for my mom and dad. Let's give a hand to all these parents in the crowd of these elite eight, because they are the best. (Applause)

Silver Anniversary Award Recipients

Ms. Cohn: Now it is time to turn our attention to this year's Silver Anniversary Award recipients. When you come across great athletes like our Silver Anniversary winners, you quickly realize that the competitive spirit that drove them to greatness in college wasn't left behind on the field after graduation. It is a part of them. Now they use that competitive spirit for new battles—battles not won or lost on the field, but ones that are now fought to help others. If you thought the headlines they created in college were impressive, wait until you hear what they have done lately.

Audiovisual Recording: In just her first two years at USC, power hitter Debbie Brown led the Trojans to two national championships and the only unbeaten season in the history of women's Division I volleyball. Debbie next set her sights on Olympic gold. However, after being named co-captain of the 1980 Olympic team, Debbie was never able to compete. Instead of bitterness, she focused on the experience of traveling to more than 15 countries preparing for the games. Debbie did fulfill her lifelong Olympic dream, but this time she had a new role as an assistant coach in 1988 and in 2002 as an Olympic torch bearer.

Success seems to follow Debbie wherever she goes—at Arizona State, then on to Notre

Dame where she has led the Fighting Irish to 11 straight NCAA tournament appearances. When this three-time Big East coach of the year is not on the volleyball court, she is holding court as a motivational speaker for the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, making Debbie a success story that shines as brightly as any gold medal.

Ms. Cohn: Debbie Brown, University of Southern California. When Debbie stepped on the volleyball court for the first time in high school, little did she know that those were the first steps to becoming an all-American, a national champion, Olympian and a legend. Ladies and gentlemen, Debbie Brown. (Applause)

Debbie will receive her Silver Anniversary Award from Kevin White, athletics director, University of Notre Dame. (Applause)

Our next recipient is Ann Meyers-Drysdale, University of California, Los Angeles. Few women have blazed a trail that shines as brightly today as it did 25 years ago. Ann Meyers-Drysdale is one of those people, no question about that. A three-sport athlete, she played volleyball and was a member of UCLA's national championship track and field team. But of course, it was on the basketball court where she truly shined.

Audiovisual Recording: Her jersey on the court may have said No. 15, but it might as well have said No. 1. The first woman in UCLA history to receive an athletic scholarship, Ann Meyers-Drysdale led the Bruins to the number one position in college basketball, the 1978 championship crown. By the time she graduated, she held the number one ranking in 12 of 13 UCLA records and added an Olympic silver medal to her collection of awards.

Her moves on the basketball court caught the attention of the NBA and the Indiana Pacers. She became the first and only woman ever to be signed by the NBA. At a time when men seemed to rule the professional sports arenas, Ann proved that female athletes were ready to take them on.

Soon her circle of admirers included basketball greats like John Wooden and Kareem Abdul-Jabbar. Her ability to quickly analyze action on the court led her to a career where she still captures the nation's attention—this time as a network sports television analyst. Her No. 15 jersey may have been retired, but to her fans she is always number one.

Ms. Cohn: Ladies and gentlemen, Ann Meyers-Drysdale. (Applause) She will receive her Silver Anniversary Award from Betsy Stephenson, senior woman administrator, University of California, Los Angeles. (Applause)

Next is Dale Kramer, Carleton College of Minnesota. As a four-time national champion, our next honoree gives new meaning to the phrase "A run for your money."

Audiovisual Recording: When Dale Kramer crossed the finish line, the applause he received was music to his ears. It was a symphony that he heard many times. His dominance in cross country while at Carleton College made him a two-time national champion.

His ensemble of running accolades also included twice winning the 5,000 meters in the NCAA Division III Track and Field Championships. His performances are today still legendary, and in 1999 Kramer was selected to the NCAA Division III men's cross country all-century team.

These days, he sports a business suit instead of running shoes. A certified financial planner, he serves as second vice-president of investments at Salomon Smith-Barney. When he is not enjoying a casual job, you can find him playing the trumpet, flute or saxophone for local high-school productions and volunteering to increase the arts at public schools.

Kramer knows that success is not a solo act. He invests his energies in his community and as a volunteer of the year for the Riverview Correctional Facility, always helping others who face their own long road ahead.

Ms. Cohn: Ladies and gentlemen, Dale Kramer. (Applause) Dale will receive his award from Willard Huyck, former head cross country and track and field coach at Carleton College. (Applause)

Next up is Dr. Kenneth MacAfee, University of Notre Dame. As a Heisman Trophy nominee and all-American, you can probably imagine that Dr. MacAfee took a few hard knocks on the football field. Perhaps that was all the inspiration he needed for his career today.

Audiovisual Recording: In 1977, Kenneth MacAfee gave his fans a lot to smile about. As tight end for the Fighting Irish, his sticky hands and quick feet helped guarantee Notre Dame the national championship. In that year alone, this MVP caught 54 passes and reached the end zone for six touchdowns.

Twenty years later, he joined college's elite as an inductee into the College Football Hall of Fame. As an NFL first-round draft pick, Kenneth smiled all the way to San Francisco. But during his two seasons with the 49ers, he had his eyes on dental school, attending classes in the off seasons during his NFL career.

Today, as a respected oral and maxillofacial surgeon, Dr. MacAfee helps to put a smile on the faces of others through charitable work as a United Way overseas health volunteer and advocate of homes for the homeless. For the last 25 years, Dr. MacAfee has given both football fans and patients plenty to smile about.

Ms. Cohn: Ladies and gentlemen, Dr. Kenneth MacAfee. (Applause) Dr. MacAfee will receive his Silver Anniversary Award tonight from Kevin White, athletics director at the University of Notre Dame. (Applause) Kevin, you are a busy guy tonight.

Next is Harold Warren Moon. Did you really know his first name was Harold? I bet you didn't. He is from the University of Washington. After college, Warren moved from the school that he led to get many good years out of pro football. But just like everything else about Warren, he surpassed all expectations.

Audiovisual Recording: It was a rising star that shocked the nation at the 1978 Rose Bowl. Walking on the field as the undisputed underdogs against a Michigan powerhouse, quarterback Warren Moon's performance can only be described as stellar. His completion of 12 of 23 passes led the Huskies to a 27-20 upset, marking one of the biggest upsets in Rose Bowl history.

After six years with the Canadian Football League, Moon packed his bag along with the largest NFL contract in history and headed for the Houston Oilers. For the next 17 seasons, this quarterback threw for more than 49,000 yards and was selected to eight consecutive Pro Bowls.

But if completed passes made him a champion on the field, his work outside the football stadium makes him a hero. Among many of his charitable efforts, this NFL man of the year and television broadcaster established the Crescent Moon Foundation to raise money for college academic scholarships. And that is what truly makes Warren Moon a star.

Ms. Cohn: Come on, give a hand to Harold. (Applause) He is receiving his award from Don James, former head football coach, University of Washington. (Applause)

The next recipient is Gifford Nielson, Brigham Young University. Gifford Nielson put Provo, Utah, and Brigham Young University on the map, and he marked it with a football, of course.

Audiovisual Recording: When Gifford Nielson, also known as the "Mormon Rifle," threw a football it was with deadly accuracy, leading the NCAA with 29 touchdown passes in 1976. A hometown hero in Utah, this young gun posted NCAA single-game records in total offense, passing and touchdown passes.

This Heisman Trophy nominee was also a great passer on the basketball court for BYU. But it was his ability to move the football that made a fan of even radio icon Paul Harvey, who read Gifford's stats each week to millions.

Not only was the NFL listening, they were watching. Soon Gifford became a member of the Houston Oilers, playing for six seasons. Today, instead of an offensive line, Gifford is behind the news desk in Houston as a local television sports director and anchor.

He is still known to challenge a teammate or two, but this time it is on the links for charity. Through his annual Giff Nielson United Way Golf Tournament, he has raised more than \$2.5 million for children in the Houston area. Whether it's throwing a football or serving the community, Gifford's aim always seems to be on target.

Ms. Cohn: Before I introduce Gifford Nielson, I need to know one thing. What is your handicap?

Mr. Nielson: It is different each time.

Ms. Cohn: That is a safe answer. Give a big hand to Gifford Nielson. (Applause) Gifford will receive his Silver Anniversary Award tonight from his brother-in-law, who is also the advancement vice-president at Brigham Young University, Fred Skousen. (Applause)

Now, Gifford will speak on behalf of all of the Silver Anniversary winners.

Response - Gifford Nielson

Mr. Nielson: What an honor it is to have a chance to say a few words and to get an award from Fred Skousen. He is the advancement vice-president at Brigham Young University who happens to be my brother-in-law. He is married to my oldest sister, Julie, and I am thrilled to have the opportunity to have that happen.

I don't know how many of you saw the program. Warren, what happened to your hair? Dale, what happened to your hair? I will tell you that Warren and I go way back because of that big punt crack he put me right into television and I appreciate that.

I was recently speaking with a friend who has a construction company on the East coast, who builds large structures, office space and retail shops. I was interested to learn about how much time he as an engineer put into securing the foundations of his projects. He told me that while the time it takes for each foundation may vary, it is definitely the most important part of the building process. He explained the study of the geotechnical characteristics of the soil and how it was critical to calculating the weight distributed to the foundation's columns in many facilities, and the foundation sets the direction for the building.

It is a privilege to stand before you this evening representing the Silver Anniversary recipients, an impressive group. I have done a lot of thinking about why are we here? Each one of us has our own story, but along the path of life someone was there to help us realize our own self-worth.

For me, it started in my home where my parents taught me confidence, loyalty, love and respect. They understood that by testing the soil early in my life, it would help me to handle the weight of life's experiences. I am going to do that currently with my family. They are all here, my six children, my beautiful wife, Wendy, my mother and my mother-in-law. It has been a great delight to be in Southern California with them.

As a student-athlete of Brigham Young University, I recall the day-to-day rigors of being tested academically, spiritually, athletically and often thinking back to those childhood teachers. Somewhere along the path of life, each one has a mentor, a builder who steps in at the most crucial moments to help us distribute the weight and set the foundation that will determine who we will become.

As a husband and father, and even a grandfather, if you can believe that, as a leader in my church and as the sports director at KHOU Television in Houston, I often reflect upon my college experiences. From them I gain insight about handling today's challenges.

Having played for the legendary LaVell Edwards at Brigham Young University, I learned the value of a steady hand. Those of you who saw LaVell on the sidelines, his arms were always folded. We didn't get a chance to see his hands very much. He was always prepared, grounded in his approach and quietly confident in his teams. To be led by an athletic director who many of you know, Glen Tuckett, who was supported by the rest of the BYU admin-

istration, was for me a lesson in loyalty and professionalism. In fact, our athletic director, Val Hale, is with us this evening. I trust that each one of my distinguished colleagues here tonight has similar feelings about their colleagues.

So, as we look at the future and continue to build upon the solid footings of the past, what is expected out of us? Perhaps many things, but I do know this: We can have a powerful influence upon those who come after us by taking a position of integrity.

In his book "Standing for Something," the president of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints said, and I quote: "We cannot be indifferent to the great because of truth and right. We cannot stand on the sidelines and watch the play between the forces of good and evil.

"I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot.

"So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth." That is Revelations 3, 15 and 16.

This points to how critical it is to stand strong, even to become leaders in speaking up on behalf of those because he is that who makes our civilization shine. Each of us can be leaders within our own spirit of influence. The adversary of all truth to put into our hearts, reluctance to make an effort. We must cast that fear aside and value in the cause of truth, fairness and right.

To Dr. Lawless, members of the Honors Committee, our benefactors and supporters, we express our deepest gratitude. We are here this evening primarily because of you. You are examples of help to shape us as we have sought to emulate them and make the world a better place.

We thank you as we accept this recognition tonight and commit to you our determination to build strong foundations of tomorrow. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Inspiration Award Winners

Ms. Cohn: Thank you, Giff. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor to introduce to you three extraordinary people, tonight's Inspiration Award winners. Each has had to call upon their winning spirit to bravely face their own very personal challenge. Their victories are victories of the spirit, and their lives are ones of true inspiration and of hope.

I would like to begin with Diane Geppi-Aikens, Loyola College.

As a coach, Diane Geppi-Aikens has the natural gift of helping athletes reach down and achieve more than they ever dreamed they could. Her teams have not let her down either. This past spring, the Loyola Greyhounds made their seventh straight NCAA lacrosse tournament appearance. That feat alone is remarkable, but it is even more amazing when you learn that while Diane was coaching her team to victory, she was facing her own personal opponent—brain cancer.

Diagnosed with a brain tumor in 1995, Diane has endured three brain surgeries, the last just a year ago, to combat an aggressive tumor. But radiation and chemotherapy treatments and fatigue and nausea did not stop her from coaching every Loyola game the past seven seasons.

As a single parent, Diane also had to put her illness aside when she came home to her four children each night. The lacrosse family that fought so hard for her on the field, now helped her in a fight for her life and enveloped Diane's children with love and support.

Ever the inspirational coach, Diane often speaks to patients who are newly diagnosed with brain cancer. Against an opponent like no other, Diane has achieved more than anyone could have ever dreamed of her. Her battle is personal but her victories are celebrated by many.

Diane will receive the Inspiration Award from Joe Boylan, athletics director, Loyola College. Give a hand to Diane. (Applause)

Response - Diane Geppi-Aikens

Ms. Geppi-Aikens: They gave me this mike, and my dad says my brain may not work but my mouth still does. They told me to keep it brief, and the only people who know that I can't see that are my two loyal assistant coaches. But I will do it.

First of all, I want to thank the NCAA Honors Committee for all their hard work. I want to congratulate the rest of the honorees. The behind-the-scene people worked hard to make this day for these people. Today has been a wonderful day for all recipients. I hope I speak for everybody up on the stage, that it has run smoothly behind the scenes. Thank you for the impressive day and you can keep one more thing, my praises for my two sisters who are going to steal the chair. Good luck on that. I want to thank you for being here. I thank everyone. (Applause)

Ms. Cohn: Thank you, Diane. As we move to our second Inspiration Award winner, her name is Amanda Walton, Yale University. Even as a freshman, Amanda was an inspiration. She exploded on the collegiate scene and by the end of her first year she was named the Ivy League rookie of the year in not one but two sports.

Her lacrosse and field hockey talents were simply jaw-dropping and her leadership was natural. But instead of inspiring her team on the field, her life was soon to take a different path. On Memorial Day weekend after her sophomore year, a speeding car running from the police demolished Amanda's car. She laid in a coma with serious head trauma and broken bones for over a month. She was battling for her life, and with that fighting spirit inside Amanda, there was no way she was going to lose. She woke from the coma but still faces a long road to recovery.

Every week, she attacks her physical speech and occupational therapies as if she were fighting for a championship title. She refuses to let the accident stop her from living life. She has challenged herself to sled skiing, horseback riding and even wind surfing.

Another goal is to again return to her beloved Ivy League field. To the excitement of the entire Yale community, she is back as a part-time assistant field hockey coach. When she returned, she returned with that legendary smile, a smile untouched by tragedy.

Ladies and gentlemen, Amanda Walton. (Applause)

Ms. Cohn: Amanda will receive her Inspiration Award tonight from Ainslee Lamb, field hockey head coach, Yale University. (Applause)

Response - Amanda Walton

Ms. Walton: Thank you, NCAA, for giving me this award. What an honor. Even though my circumstances are unfortunate, I feel proud to be here, and I want to thank those who helped me along the way. Thank you to my mom, who has been nothing short of incredible, who has devoted her life to all seven of her children.

Thank you, mom, for everything, but most especially for reminding me of the importance of hope. Without you, there is no way I could have made such gains since that tragic day in 2000. Thanks also to my family, who has been there for me no matter how painful and helped me to smile.

To my twin sister, who has and always will be my best friend. We still are riding together on that bicycle built for two. Thanks for guiding me along in the path of life.

A huge thanks to my field hockey coaches and to the folks who treated me as if I was still a physical part of the team and who have given so much of themselves to me. I am blessed to have you in my life. And to my athletic director, Tom Beckett, thank you for always believing in me. You have been a guiding light and an amazing friend. Finally, thanks to all of my friends who have been my teammates and have refused to let me quit. I am grateful for all of you. This has forever changed my perspective on life.

I also want to take this opportunity to throw you all a challenge. I want to challenge you to live life as if you were playing a game. As stellar athletes, you have heard this before, but only now after my accident do I truly understand the power of this. It is my game and talent that I believe and use every day on my road to recovery. There is something that exists for me on every street corner, whether or not I am struggling to stand at the sink, to brush my teeth or attempting to swing both legs into the bed to lie down. I recognize that these are my goal cages now, and I have to try harder to score if I want to win.

Recently, I had a series of casts on my left arm in order to stretch my shortened tendons. They are complicated results of my brain injury. There have been many times when it has been extremely painful, and I have been tempted to get them removed, but instead I see this as another opportunity to score. I keep asking myself if this pain will take me out of a field hockey or lacrosse game? The answer always is "no way." By leading my situation to the most difficult and important game that I have ever played, I am better able to rise to this challenge and bring myself one small floating meaningful step closer to winning.

Both my golden Cajuns and my recovery are my win. Each of us plays our own game and has your own struggles to overcome and dreams to reach for. What we all have in common are those attributes which make us the best of athletes—hard work, perseverance, determination, teamwork and courage. Cherish, hold on to and develop these skills. By putting on our game faces every day, we will all be one step closer to winning our games of life and reaching our dreams. Thanks and good luck in sports and in life. (Applause)

Ms. Cohn: That is Amanda Walton, an unbelievably strong woman. We wish you, Amanda, only the best in your road to recovery.

Our next Inspiration Award winner is Todd Williams, Florida State University. Even before the first ball was snapped at the 2003 Sugar Bowl, Todd Williams already felt like a winner. As one of Florida State's best-ever offensive linemen, Todd was known to topple even the biggest challenger on the football field. But then again, Todd had already tackled his biggest opponent of his life, the streets of Miami.

Having lost his mother, Todd was raised by his beloved grandmother in a low-income, crime-stricken area. When she died of diabetes, Todd, just 15 years old, chose the streets of Miami rather than going to foster care. Sleeping in cars and breaking into hotel rooms for just a warm bed, Todd was facing a life certain to end behind bars. Growing weary of his life on the street, he remembered a promise he made to his grandmother, that he would graduate from high school.

He returned to his hometown, found a low-rent apartment where he lived alone and worked three jobs to make ends meet. When he was a senior, the football coach invited him to try out for the team. Not only did he impress the coaches, his performance during that single high school season was enough to attract Florida State's attention. And the rest, as they say, is history.

Last month came perhaps the crown jewel of this amazing story. Todd graduated from Florida State with not one but two degrees—one in criminology and another in sociology.

Ladies and gentlemen, Todd Williams. (Applause)

Todd will receive his Inspiration Award tonight from Bob Minnix, associate athletics director, Florida State University. (Applause)

Response - Todd Williams

Mr. Williams: First of all, I want to thank God for bringing me through all of this. Tonight, I have been truly humbled by these two young ladies over here. I really don't have anything to complain about.

I thank Florida State for nominating me, and I also thank the NCAA for choosing me.

Tonight has been an outstanding night. I am glad to be here, and I am humbled by it. I thank all my friends and family, and all of you who have shown your support, and everybody else on the stage. Thank you. (Applause)

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Ms. Cohn: I think this is a good thing the NCAA has started, the Inspiration Award. This is the second year. Let's keep it going because it is really moving, and it is something to be a part of. I think you guys will all agree with that.

It is now time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of tonight's Honors Program, the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award. This is the highest honor to be awarded by the NCAA. In your program, and again it is a very nice program, you will see a list of past winners. It is a distinguished group, including former presidents, military leaders and visionaries.

It was President Roosevelt's vision to create an organization, later known as the NCAA, that would serve and protect the rights of student-athletes. There is no one more appropriate to be honored by this vision than our award winner tonight.

She may be just under 5-7, but she is mighty tall when it comes to standing up for the rights of student-athletes, both male and female.

Audiovisual Recording: By the time she was 17, Donna de Varona was already a two-time Olympian. But she had already felt the pains of not being able to play sports the way the boys did. She loved Little League just like her brother, but girls were not allowed to play. She wanted to swim in college, but there were no scholarships, even for a two-time Olympian.

However, the lack of any varsity teams for women didn't stop her from going to the pool every day in college. As an undergrad at UCLA, she got her pool time in by coaching the men's varsity team between classes. As a recognizable figure in the sports community, she knew that her voice could carry the voices of many. She shows us tonight that the best victories in life are the ones that we fight for others.

Known as the "Queen of Swimming," Donna de Varona was just 13-years-old when she made the 1960 Olympic team, making her the youngest U.S. swimmer to ever compete in the Olympics. Just four years later, Donna made a return trip to the Olympics and brought home a treasure of gold, winning gold in the 400 individual medley and the 400 free relay. These crown jewels were added to her 37 individual national championships and eight world records. Soon this young queen of speed took a seat next to Wide World of Sports commentator Jim McKay, and covered the 1965 AAU swimming championships, marking her as the first women sportscaster ever under contract at ABC.

These days, she is considered royalty when it comes to reporting Olympic sports, covering a total of 14 Olympic Games. But her biggest splash in the world of sports is her dedication to women's athletics. She is responsible for organizing the most successful women's sporting event ever, the 1999 Women's World Cup Soccer Tournament.

This UCLA alum has dedicated her life to creating waves of change for women's sports. Serving as the voice of many athletes, she lobbied Congress for equal rights for female athletes. Her presence in Washington has led her to advisory positions for five U.S. Presidents.

Her voice also speaks volumes through her work with the Special Olympics, USOC and as co-founder and first president of the Women's Sports Foundation. This "Queen of Swimming" leaves no doubt that her influence in sports will make a big splash for generations to come.

Ms. Cohn: Donna de Varona is such an inspiration for me. But now I call upon Dr. Bob Lawless to present the NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award. (Applause)

Mr. Lawless: Thank you, Linda. It is a distinct honor for me to present the Theodore

Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the NCAA bestows upon an individual. Donna, I will present this award to you for your lifetime dedication to others.

By providing a voice for others, you have opened the doors to opportunities that might have otherwise remained closed. Your tireless efforts for equality and opportunities for all athletes is an inspiration to all. Your example of athletic excellence and unending dedication to the plight of all athletes truly makes you a champion for a long time. Ladies and gentlemen, Ms. Donna de Varona. (Applause)

Donna de Varona

Ms. de Varona: Thank you, Bob. I don't know, but I am exhausted especially after those last honorees. You know, Mr. Gifford, I am sorry. I am thinking about Frank and Monday night Friday. Gifford talked about the lessons we learn from sports and integrity.

Amanda talked about hope and courage, and oftentimes in a sporting world we turn those terms around. I am certainly proud to be up here with all these special honorees, because they lived those things. I think they bring home the reason why we are all in this room.

I know I am a lifer, why we are lifers in sports, because sports has a way of visually confirming the journey of life in so many ways. So, first of all, I want to congratulate all the winners and I want to congratulate the committee that appointed the winners. Before we move on, because this is a turning point in NCAA history, I want to thank Cedric Dempsey and the female athletes for his leadership in bringing women's sports to the forefront on the collegiate level. This is his last session, and I have not been able to see him today. But I was most recently appointed to the athletic commission and true to his word, during his testimony before the commission, he reiterated this organization and the President's Board of Title IX. He called for no changes, he called for stricter enforcement. He suggested the Office of Civil Rights should educate its own representatives in the field to help institutions come into compliance with one of the most important civil rights laws in history.

Yesterday, I know he was joined by Myles Brand and his commitment to Title IX and all the wonderful things that he has done in helping to reinforce the quality of opportunity in our educational institutions. It is interesting that 35 years difference doesn't say sex, it says non-discrimination in our educational vocationals.

A principle that I have been able to share with my peers around the world, as one who took part early on in the Title IX debate, were fearsome. I would say this, Mr. Walter Byers, who really didn't like Title IX as it related to sports, I find myself incredibly surprised that I am standing here today 30 years later accepting the award from the NCAA, enjoying this award with past presidents like Gerald Ford, Ronald Reagan, the late Mayor Tom Bradley who I knew, and now standing as such with Althea Gibson and John Wooden, and the great Jesse Owens.

I am humble, but I am eager to let you know, especially the athletes in the audience, that sports brought me into each one of those individual's past, and we were able to share moments where we worked in the sport programs and discussed the future of sports in the United States. Each time this experience has been more than rewarding. Following in the footsteps of Eunice Kennedy Shriver, last year's Teddy Award honoree and the founder of Special Olympics, I am reminded of the strong influence she has had in my life. A visionary who never takes no for an answer, she has used this to teach the world about the mental challenge and she has the power to inspire others. In many ways, her living has helped to do the two Olympic ideals. I am often asked about my passion for the sporting world, because of the values competition can teach, which is never giving up, setting up game plans, reaching for goals, making come-backs and dealing with pressures, mine goes on beyond the field of playing.

Although I love to watch the Super Bowl and the World Series and college football, I stayed active because of the possibilities of what big sports offer to a world. That is why I have great hopes that in the future, as Myles Brand continues to work on NCAA reform, that he and the organization will continue to explore ways to work for the United States Olympic Committee and other independent sport organizations. My hope is that some goodwill comes out of the box, thinking about pooling the vast resources we have in this country, the establishment of more creative programs for more athletes in more sports than ever before. The goal is that we can go beyond the unproductive and so far destructive blame game we have been caught up in the past months as we have debated the status of sports in America.

When we need to be in the United States, we are innovators, creators and visionaries. Post 9-11 is a nation in mourning. We rallied to those in the world during the most successful Winter Olympics in the history and the United States won an unprecedented 34 medals. It all went off without a hitch. We have filled the Rose Bowl for the Women's Cup Soccer finals before that tournament began. Few thought that we would be able to sell 100,000 tickets, much less 650,000 tickets. We have created the most popular and lucrative tennis tournament in the world and we have made college football a Christmas time tradition.

We have to believe that what the future holds for student-athletes does not mean contraction but expansion. I am often asked how many years long the journey took me to get to the Olympic podium. Looking back, I think I was just born with a desire to compete, to accomplish something special in my life. It was a passion that drove me, enriched me and would not let go of me. All of this is to matter in life, to count, to belong. My yearnings for these things came to me as I followed my dad and my big brother to the football field, the ball diamond in Oakland, California. Dad was devoted to the sport and the challenge of the divorced single mom in the '30s, sport gave dad an important role model and a future. As a member of Cal's all-American football team who in 1938 captured the university's first international rowboat championship, dad found himself on the eighth crew. He was being recruited for the sport while walking on campus. It must have been then that dad played an important role in the children's life, and what he did for his 9-year-old daughter. I had already been organized right out of my favorite game.

In grade school I made a point of placing myself nearest the door that was closest to the baseball diamond. When the recess bell rang, I was first out there on the pitcher's mound. In those days, sandlot games could last weeks and I would relish every minute. Then along came Little League. I was frustrated that I could not play. I followed my brother, Dave, to practice anyway. I spent my allowance on bubble gum and bribed my way into the dugout. Soon the team gave me a uniform, and I was, to my brother's embarrassment, made the official bat girl of the Little League baseball team. But when the next year rolled around and the coach asked me to come back, I said no.

He said, "Why not?" I said, "Because I can't bear to sit on the bench anymore. I want to know what it is like to get up to bat, to face the pitcher, to strike, or hit a home run. I just want to have a chance to play." Then not knowing it would take some 20 years before little girls were allowed to play in Little League, and to my brother's delight, I found the swimming pool. From the summer recreational program where I worked in the towel room for 25 cents an hour, to the Oakland YMCA and to the Oakland swim club, my career was filled with incredible lessons, great coaching and fantastic memories. In 1960, as the youngest member of the rowing Olympic team at the age of 13, I remember most the ceremonies. Expectations can sometime take the joy out of victory, but it cannot take away your respect for yourself. And that focus in those moments is potential.

In 1965, winning the gold was an end and not a beginning. While male counterparts were on scholarships, there were no scholarships for Olympic gold-medalist winning women.

Accordingly, I sought work, and lucky for me, I began my relationship with ABC Sports with the grateful knowledge that just passed away the visionary that created Monday Night, Wide World of Sports, and the coverage, as we know it, Nightline, and then I began my anchor in sports.

It has been an incredible journey. So far, most of you have been able to build through the young journey. The American system, we must all protect, because this is where we're learning some very dear lessons, free to be free, and we have to fight for every inch, and we have to respect what our father's fears have given us.

Gifford said in his speech that those of us who make it to the victory stand do not do so alone. Tonight, I would like to indulge you with my teammates, the people who made a difference in my life. They are right over here, this part of the room. They are my husband, my sister-in-law, my mother-in-law, Celeste, Tom McClain; my Olympic coach, Peter Galen from the University of Southern California. I was lucky enough to swim on that team. During his time, he was coaching for no money because they believed in the views of America. I would like to thank Bob Horn, who convinced me to get my grades up so I could go to UCLA, and at the last minute I was able to get my application in so I could attend UCLA and become a Bruin. I would like to introduce John Nabors, a five-time Olympic medalist, four golds for Montreal, and I would like to introduce Chuck Bittig, who was the 1960 Olympic team member in water polo, as was Bob Horn. They made me the team mascot when I was 13. I would like to introduce Dr. Samuel Lee, winner of two Olympic gold medals, and boy did he have to overcome some big hurdles of discrimination.

Tonight, we gather to celebrate each other and to celebrate all that sport offers. I am humbled by this award. I want to thank you for singling me out. I want to promise you that I will do everything that I can and continue to do everything I can to help the organization in America to continue to be visionary so that young people can be the best they can possibly be and learn the lessons of life, through the playing fields of sport. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Lawless: Donna, undoubtedly, there are many proud fans and former teammates across the country who are thrilled to have you receive tonight's highest honor. In fact, we have received a special congratulatory greeting from Alaska Senator Ted Stevens, a fellow UCLA alumni. I will give you that. Also, as a tribute to Donna's alma mater, please join me in recognizing Dan Guerrero, UCLA athletics director. Ladies and gentlemen, Dan Guerrero. (Applause)

Thank you very much, Linda, for helping us celebrate tonight the victories each of our honorees have enjoyed both on and off the playing field. Believe it or not, you did a fantastic job helping to tell their stories. (Applause) In fact, your dedication to your own career in sports is also cause for celebration. As a token of our appreciation, the NCAA will make a donation to the Oswego College Foundation in your name. (Applause)

Ms. Cohn: That is great. Thank you.

Mr. Lawless: For those of you who would like to share tonight's program with family and friends who couldn't be here tonight, tonight's program will be highlighted during a special ESPN presentation on Thursday, February 6, at 1 p.m. Eastern time. I would like to again thank our honorees tonight for sharing their lives with us. Your definition of success, both on and off the playing field, inspires us all. I hope that everyone here tonight will remember the standard of excellence that these fine individuals have set for us, and that we remember their selflessness the next time we ourselves are asked to reach for the good of others.

When you think about tonight, I believe, it does underline and underscore what I said at the beginning of the evening. When you think about athletics, think of the impact that it has on people's lives and how they then impact society. When you think of inspiration that is given to all of us by our three Inspiration Award winners, I believe this has to be one of the intercollegiate athletics finest hours.

Before we depart tonight, I would like to ask all of our honorees to stand one final time so we can applaud your accomplishments and show our appreciation one last time.
(Applause)

Thank you all very much and have a good evening and a very happy 2003 new year.

Division I Forum

Monday Morning January 13, 2003

The Division I Forum was called to order at 8 a.m., with Division I Management Council Chair Percy Bates, presiding.

Mr. Bates: Good morning, everyone. My name is Percy Bates. I am chair of the Division I Management Council. I want to take this opportunity to welcome all of you to the Division I Forums this morning.

The first session is going to deal with the NCAA Division I governance process. We are going to try to examine the state of the governance process five years after restructuring. The session will focus on the recent work of the Governance Subcommittee of the Management Council regarding the length of the legislative cycle and the role of the Convention in the NCAA governance process. Our speakers this morning will be Rich Ensor, commissioner of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference; Darlene Bailey, associate athletic director of Southwest Missouri State, Missouri Valley Conference; Alison Cone, senior associate woman administrator, Cal Poly; Jim Murphy, director of athletics at Davidson College; and Stan Wilcox, associate commissioner of the Big East Conference. Also, Todd Petr, NCAA research director.

I will turn it over to Rich Ensor.

Governance Forum

Richard Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): Good morning. There is nothing like a good governance meeting at 8 a.m. on a Monday to get the blood flowing. I appreciate you all coming today. We have three hand-outs in front of you to follow the discussion. One deals with the Convention models that are under consideration. The second is a copy of the Power Point handouts that we will be going through on the data of the survey and some other issues. The third is the compiled data from the recent NCAA governance survey. If you have those three items, you should be able to follow along.

I want to thank the panelists for joining me this morning and thank Percy for that introduction.

As a way of introduction, I would like to talk a little bit about how we got to where we are today. In 1996, the membership adopted legislation to establish the current governance structure. This structure was filled in over a number of months and was completed through 1997. At the time, restructuring of the governance system was termed the most significant reform of the governance structure in the NCAA's history as we went through a process of setting up the current representative forum within Division I, and allowing for Divisions II and III to set up their own systems independent of Division I.

At the time, the goals of restructuring were to provide greater federation both within the

three divisions and also within Division I, and most importantly, it was to establish that the presidents and CEOs of our institutions were the ultimate governance authority.

Third was to simplify the administrative structure of our governance process. Some five years later, as we sit here and review the process and the system that we put in place, we see through the 2002 Ad Hoc Review Committee Report that the institutions believe that the new structure did, in fact, provide institutional CEOs with greater authority, did provide non-divisional autonomy, but did not simplify the governance process by any means, although the survey did indicate by a slight majority that the CEOs did think it did.

The question then remains why did restructuring only achieve two of the three goals? In the beginning, we feel that the system that utilized four legislative cycles and two comment periods was just too confusing to the membership. That certainly came back to us through the ad hoc committee's work. Secondly, institutions and conferences struggled to develop effective methods of communications within their conferences and then within the institution between the relevant parties, whether they be the athletic directors or the senior woman's administrators, faculty athletic reps and the CEOs. We also have found that administrators checked out and never checked back after changes were made to the legislative process. That means that in many cases the oversight of the governance process on the institution has been delegated and that the chief administrators in some cases are not involved in tracking the system and have become confused over the years about where any piece of legislation was in the system. In addition, some people don't like the representative form of government. That was certainly something that we knew going in was going to be a big change. We went from a system of one institution, one vote developed at a Convention to a system of representative governance.

The conferences picked their representatives and that small group did the work of the Association as a whole. In some, we think the complexity has led to a sense of disengagement within the membership. At least that is what the governance committee that has been studying this over the last year has found. The loss of ownership of the process has come back to us from many different sources as the problem that needs to be addressed. We believe that the process is so complex that people have just let go of it, and that is a problem for us all because we need to have people involved in the governance system. We are the governance process. We are the ones that need to run the Association, and when we get disengaged it is not healthy at all. The role of the governance committee—and I thank the members here again today—was to go out—we were charged last year at the NCAA Convention by the Board of Directors, and then Cedric Dempsey at our joint luncheon—and study why these problems have arisen and what are the solutions?

The committee has over the past 12 months tried to get many different constituencies involved in providing feedback to us. We have heard the members' frustration regarding the structure. We also understand that solutions will not be easy. We believe the subcommittee has put itself in a position to offer suggestions to the membership and to the governance structure that currently exists on how to improve. We feel a responsibility to the membership to provide the current structure with a sense of your frustrations.

During the past year, the subcommittee has studied the issue and we have listened to the membership. We have heard and solicited comments from the I-A, I-AA and I-AAA directors of athletics associations. We have solicited feedback from the faculty athletic reps association and we have reached out to other constituencies to provide us with some sense of where they thought the process was. We surveyed the membership in two different surveys. First, we surveyed the conferences, and then most recently, this past fall we provided a survey to the CEOs to give us feedback as it related to the Convention process and the governance process.

Early on, there was no consensus. We felt that there was still a need to get further data,

and that led to the survey that went out to the CEOs late this fall. We were pleasantly surprised at the response that we received given the tight time frame. There was over 164 members that did respond, and that has given us a good sense of where the membership stands. That survey was e-mailed to CEOs and copied to the ADs, SWAs and the athletic reps. We asked the conferences to assist us in collecting the data, urging their members to submit to the NCAA so that we would have a good sample and be able to report back to you on the different solutions that are presented.

I want to thank NCAA staffers Todd Petr and Eric Hartung, for their speedy analysis. They really put in quite a bit of time and effort during the month of December, during the holiday season, to get this done. I am going to ask Todd to come up and take us through the survey results. We will then come back and talk about two distinctive issues, one being the legislative cycle, and then the second issue will be the Convention and the possible formats that it can take in the future. We will ask for an opportunity after both those presentations for Q and A. Thank you, Todd.

Todd Petr (NCAA Staff): Thanks, Rich. I appreciate the opportunity to be here and share a few slides based on the survey that was conducted on the governance structure and what the sense of the Division I membership is of the current structure and some possible alternatives for the structuring of the Convention.

As Rich said, we were fairly happy with the response rate, especially given the fact that we had a very short time frame and we were in the holidays. Overall, we got about 50 percent of Division I to respond to the survey. Division I-A and I-AA was all over 50 percent, and I-AAA was over 50 percent. We think we got some good generalized findings and have a good sense of where the membership is at on these issues based on this response rate.

What I first want to look at in terms of some of the issues, is people's impressions of the current Convention format and what the Division I membership has said about that. When you look at the Convention attendance from last year, just over half of the institutions said they sent at least one representative to the Convention, which jives with the actual numbers that we have seen over the course of the last few years since restructuring of the Division I membership. As you know, these numbers would have been at or very near 100 percent before the restructuring. That has been an ongoing issue for the Division I membership and one of the issues that I think this committee has been working on. We asked them to tell us why they did not attend. The majority of the responses to that question was there is simply no institutional voting, and that is what keeps us away. Some people said it was a budget issue or that the topics were not of particular interest. It was really the fact that there is no voting that is causing people to stay away.

We also asked them specifically about some of the types of events that are currently at the Convention. There was a lot of support for almost everything that is currently going on. The only one that didn't receive at least half of the membership saying they thought it was important was the keynote speech from an external visible individual. Otherwise, the forums got very high support. The address of the president was also very high. People seem to be saying what is here, they thought ought to be here. Although as you notice, the blue bars here would be things that would likely make you attend a Convention, and those are always lesser than the responses should those things be included. I think that we are still searching for ways to get folks here.

Rich, I will turn it back over to you to talk a little bit about the legislative cycle.

Mr. Ensor: The data we received back from the survey indicated to us that the membership felt that even a two-month legislative cycle that we have gone to over the last few years, reduced from the original four, was too complex to track and react to in a timely manner on campus and in a manner that allowed them to provide feedback to the Council and the Board to react to.

The survey also provided the membership with a comparison of the two six-month legislative cycles and a proposed one, 12-month legislative cycle. The membership was asked as part of that survey to indicate its level of support, and I think we have some slides on that.

Mr. Petr: Yes, we have one slide on this. This was a very clear answer from the membership. As you can see, in all subdivisions and the overall group, three-quarters or more of the individuals were in support of a single legislative cycle as opposed to the current two cycles in Division I. This was certainly the most clear result from the survey.

Mr. Ensor: It certainly was clear, and the overall 82 percent favoring the single legislative cycle led the governance committee at its meeting this past week to recommend to the Council that we go back to a single legislative cycle beginning next year.

Now, I want to walk you through that cycle. The cycle, basically, requires—and I don't like what we did under the old system—that conference submissions for legislation will be deadlines as July 15th for the first time this year, 2003. By mid-August, the Management Council and the Administrative Committee will cycle those legislative proposals from the membership out to the two Cabinets for their review and comments and possible endorsement. That will take place in September of 2003, for the first time under this new proposed system. The Management Council will then do an initial approval in late October 2003. That approval will then trigger a comment period that would overlap with the 2004 Convention that is scheduled for Nashville. At that Convention, there would be forums for the membership to react to major agenda items that would be before the Council in April.

In April, the Council would meet again and approve any legislative proposals or disapprove those that were not deemed worthy of approval and provide those to the Board for consideration at its late April or early May meeting in 2004 for the first time. All legislative enactments would become effective the following August. The new legislative cycle would not allow for any grandfathering of current legislative proposals that are in the system. So anything that was not approved as of this April, 2003, under the current structure would just be folded into the new system.

It really doesn't have that big of an impact, because the effective date would have been August anyway. So they would just be folded into the new system. Additionally, there will be an emergency or noncontroversial legislative process enacted. There are those provisions under the current system. They were there under the old system and they would be there under this system. In that way, we would be able to take care of technical adjustments, the legislation, or if there was an emergency that needed to be addressed legislatively, the Council and Board could act by using that provision.

The way that these things would be deemed emergencies or noncontroversial basically revolve around the percentage of the Council or the Board that would approve it. While that percentage has not been determined yet, it would probably be at a minimum 75 percent of the Council approving a measure in order to have it enacted immediately on an emergency or noncontroversial basis. Again, this allows us to keep some kind of ability to react swiftly to issues that need to be addressed, which was one of the criticisms of the old Convention system of one institution and one vote. It didn't allow for critical responses to major issues.

Additionally, there will be a legislative committee set up as a subcommittee of the Council to work for the Council in terms of weeding out different proposals, making recommendations and developing a Convention or legislative notice that would be provided to the membership that will allow you to track the different elements that are being proposed in this system.

One of the criticisms of the current system is that you cannot track where legislation is. To a certain extent, that is not true because certainly there would be alternatives. I think many of the conferences provide tracking mechanisms. One of the simplest ways to address

that issue is to just develop a notice to the membership that will be developed sometime after the October Council meeting and will be available at the Convention for the forums and then leading into the April meeting for final approval. People would know what legislation was in place and it could be tracked easily. This was also one of the issues that came up under many of the responses that have indicated over time that people missed the opportunity to sit down on campus with their CEO and faculty athletic rep and AD and just go through the Convention Notice item by item. This will reinstate that system to allow for easier oversight of this process.

I think that pretty much covers it. This system was approved at the Management Council this past weekend. It wasn't a legislative requirement that you needed to go for comment and be voted on. It is a policy change and the Council at its meeting this past week approved this new legislative cycle and will roll it out again this coming July.

That is the good news that we have today from the membership that reacted with over 82 percent telling us you wanted a single legislative cycle. The Council has acted in that regard. I will open it up now for some comments concerning the legislative cycle.

Are there any questions? Is there anybody awake? Okay. We will now move on to the Convention options. We heard through the surveys, anecdotal information and from meetings with the different constituent groups that I talked about earlier, that the membership wants a revitalized Convention. They miss the community. They miss the education. In many cases, they miss the opportunity to vote on legislation as an Association of the whole. The question then becomes how do we go about that because there are certainly various opinions of what the Convention can entail and what kind of model we could use.

In the survey itself, we provided nine options to the membership on how different Convention models could be established. This included educational models, voting models and combinations of the two. At this point, we are going to go through the different options through some slides.

Mr. Petr: In terms of the response to the different options, I think you have the options in some of the hand-outs that you have. The current Convention option is Option C. Perhaps this is an issue of the grass is always greener, or something like that, but it didn't receive a lot of support. Option H actually is the one that got the most level of support. These bars represent people who said they strongly supported or supported each of these options. Option H is essentially the closest thing we have to the old format. It is one institution and one vote, obviously, with the caveat that in any of these options, the Division I Board would still have a final say on all legislation. The option that didn't provide for a specific system, like a one-institution, one-vote system, that got the most support was Option B, which essentially forms like this at the beginning of the Convention, followed by some conference meetings and conference discussions, and then come back toward the latter part of the Convention for directed voting on some of these issues. Of the non-institutional voting, that was the one that got the most support.

Mr. Ensor: The percentage for the support relative to Option C was fairly low. There generally was strong opposition to it,. There has been a sense that this just reiterates the problem we have had with the Convention and the Convention attendance that led to the Board of Directors last year charging the committee to look at this issue.

Convention Options H and I basically are similar, except one has weighted voting and one has one institution, one vote. Again, I have got to reiterate that under none of these options do we consider the removal of the Board of Directors as part of the process. The Board of Directors that was constituted under the new governance system will remain in all cases. One of the reasons we think there is support for the one institution, one vote is because the Board would remain fairly strong with its weighted voting on that level.

There is a political solution with the Board that could react to any voting that took place

on the Council. I think that is why we have seen such a good response to H and I, because I think there's that recognition that the Board still will remain in place as a final authority. For Alternative H, overall, there was 66 percent support for it. In I-A, it was 56 percent. I-AA was 72 percent and I-AAA was 78 percent. I think with AA and AAA, in particular, the fact that all conferences have not been represented on the current Board is somewhat the underlying reason why the institutions want to go back to one institution and one vote knowing that the Board will still remain. Both N and I have support, not quite as strong as H, 45 percent overall, in both the overall number and the I-A number; 46 percent in AA and 42 percent in I-AAA. If Alternative H is adopted, the likelihood of attendance within the Division I membership increases dramatically, upwards to 83 percent for the whole group and 82, 81, 86 for the three subgroups.

If the ultimate intention is to increase attendance at the Convention and re-energize the process, it would seem that H provides that occurrence. The hot topics issue forum, which is Option B, also received strong support. This was a system whereby the conferences would meet and there would be forums on the topics that are before the Association, and then there would be conference directed voting. Theoretically, the Council then would meet afterwards and from those directed votes determine the adoption or failure of any legislative proposal. Again, the percentages of the support, 55 percent overall. Interestingly enough, 49 percent was the lowest. Division I-AA was 59 percent and I-AAA was 62 percent.

If Alternative B was adopted, our attendance would only increase to 54 percent overall. Again, 53, 51, 60 based on the subdivisions, not as high as H. As a result of this data, at the recent Council meeting, the governance committee proposed that the committee be charged with developing a proposal to present to the Council at its April meeting. This proposal was adopted by the Council and the subcommittee will be working on this over the next few months as we proceed towards the April Council meeting. The April Council meeting may not involve a vote on the proposal, but rather just a review and feedback with the proposals, perhaps coming forward somewhere thereafter.

It is anticipated that if any major change such as the voting were to occur as a result of the survey, that it would necessitate a special voting Convention to pass the proposal. That Convention would be a constitutional Convention as it is called for under our bylaws. In order to pass the legislation that would change the current format of governance in the Convention, that would require a five-eighths vote. That could occur as soon as the 2004 Convention, depending on the will of the Council and Board.

As we study this, we will be looking at different models based on B, H and I. In my own mind, I can envision a system by which the conferences would meet at the Convention, like we did under the old system, and go through legislative items to be followed by a forum on hot topics on day two, and then some form of weighted or one institution, one vote on days three and four. That is my thinking as I look at B, H and I. I think when you combine the three, this is where you end up. Whether or not the committee will think that as well, we will see as we progress through the next few months. At least that is the way I read the data at this point.

It is time for any comments or questions concerning the Convention. If you would like, please come up to the microphone and identify yourself.

Carol Iwaoka (Big Ten Conference): Can I talk more about the one-cycle policy change with you? This is more about logistics than perhaps the governance subcommittee discussed. When we talked about it, it is effective immediately, correct?

Mr. Ensor: That is correct.

Ms. Iwaoka: We are going into the July 15th deadline right now?

Mr. Ensor: Yes, for the 2003-04 academic year.

Ms. Iwaoka: I am assuming in order to have a smooth transition, all of the issues relat-

ed to the moratorium and deregulation submission of proposals are still in effect. In other words, certain bylaws are still not subject, or conferences can't introduce proposals for those bylaws, so that is still in effect?

Mr. Ensor: That is correct.

Ms. Iwaoka: Was there any discussion by the governance subcommittee that if we look at one-legislative cycle how the amendment process would now work? Right now, what we have is the amendments on the floor or, there used to be formal amendments-to-the-amendment. So if we are going to have one cycle, is that going to be re-introduced?

Mr. Ensor: We have not talked about amendments to amendments. Under the current system, those will be made at the Council level. Of course, they go out for further comment depending on if they restrict or expand the scope of the legislative proposals.

I would assume that that will remain in effect so that the Council at its October meeting could make amendments to the proposals that would be voted on in April. We have not talked about whether or not the amendments could be made in April. I don't know what effect that would have on the legislation. We will certainly look at that.

Ms. Iwaoka: Thank you. I have another question as it relates to the timing of conference meetings with April now being more the final process. I know that more conferences might meet currently now after the April Management Council meeting in May, rather than before. I guess it might be considered in terms of the conference restructuring in scheduling and what that impact might be. I am speaking off the top of my head right now. I know a lot of conferences might meet before the October meeting rather than before the April meeting.

Mr. Ensor: We would anticipate that you would also use your summer meeting to get legislation, if you could, before the July 15th deadline. There was some talk about that. We would require adjustment of the conference meeting schedules. Also, as to the Cabinets, right now we oftentimes get the proposals coming out of the Cabinets a week or two before the Council meeting. I think whether the Council gets moved back a little bit in October or the Cabinets have to meet earlier, there is going to have to be some adjustments on that time frame.

Any other questions? Thank you.

Mr. Bates: We will begin the discussion in about 15 minutes, so please don't go too far away. Thank you.

[Note: The delegates recessed for 15 minutes.]

Championship Format Forum

Mr. Bates: We are ready to begin our second session. Please move toward your seats. We are now ready to begin our second forum session. This session will include a discussion of the work of the brackets and format subcommittee as well as a review of the principle governing bracket sizes, pairings, site selection and seeding.

To make those presentations this morning, we have Jean Lenti Ponsetto, who chairs the Championships/Competition Cabinet and is the director of athletics at DePaul University, Conference USA. We have the chair of the playing and practice subcommittee, Bev Lewis, director of women's athletics, University of Arkansas, Southeastern Conference. I will now turn it over to Jean.

Ms. Ponsetto: Thank you, Perry. Before you get too far away from us, I do want to thank you as you finish up your term as the Management Council chair and let you know how much the Cabinet has appreciated your support with all of our requests and for the legislation that we moved forward. On behalf of all of us, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you. (Applause)

Bev is the chair of the bracket format subcommittee and the two of us are going to try to tag team this presentation for you this morning. Before we do that, I would like to let everybody here know and take this opportunity to acknowledge and recognize some of the other Championships/Competition Cabinet folks who are in the audience and some of the folks who have already served. I saw a couple of you this morning when I walked in. I have had the good fortune to serve with the Cabinet since its inception. It takes an entire village to raise a child. You can look at that in terms of our student-athletes or look at it in terms of the work that the Championships/Competition Cabinet does. More than some of the work of other committees that we have in the Association, the Cabinet greatly affects our student-athletes. I would like to ask all of the Championships/Competition Cabinet members, if you will please stand and if we can just acknowledge them for a minute. I know that there are several of you in the room. (Applause) Thank you.

I want to make one thing very clear before we start, because I think so many folks have a perception that this process began as a result of the 9-11 tragedy. It did not. We have had this on our agenda since the beginning of the Championships/Competition Cabinet to find a way to better manage or at least review the work of our sport committees that deal with all of our championships. I want to present that first and foremost, because I think a lot of people think or there is a perception out there that much of the work that came forward, or the philosophy we are going to explain to you, was the result of that unfortunate tragedy. In fact, it was not.

From our perspective, the process for bracketing and formatting our championships truly wasn't broken. There was not anything wrong with it. But I think in an effort to do a better job of managing the resources that have been allocated to the Championships/Competition Cabinet, we felt it was really important for us to take a look at and certainly to review the way we spend our dollars. Not lost on any of us should be the fact that each year as we went before the budget committee of the Board of Directors, there was also a call on their part to inquire with us as to whether or not we were being responsible with the way we were spending and allocating the dollars that were being given to us. Our priorities have always been with regard to the championships/competition program and particularly championships program to make sure we provided quality access to the student-athletes and to all the conferences, as well as the quality of the championships experience for our student-athletes. Certainly, not lost on any of us is the fiscal responsibility that goes along with that.

We do have a Power Point presentation. I think everyone has one of these at your seats. Without any further comment, I am going to take you through that. We decided to form a bracket and format subcommittee in June of 2001, which again you will note predated the unfortunate tragedy. This was the result of us really feeling that we needed to do a review of the overall program and make sure that there was some consistency and to also make sure that what was put in place and what had been approved by the old Executive Committee or the current Championships/Competition Cabinet is being followed.

As you see before you, we tried to put together a broad base of Cabinet members who represented Divisions of I-A, I-AA and I-AAA and folks who had had some experience in championships—either as sport committee members or had been in a position where they themselves on their campuses or conference offices had hosted a number of NCAA Championships. We wanted people who had a good breadth of experience as well as faculty reps so they could really talk about issues like academic impact and how our championships affected academic impact. So you see before you the bracket and format subcommittee folks. The charge of the subcommittee is to make recommendations to the full Cabinet on issues related to championships expansion, automatic qualification, site selection, bracket assignments, championships format, seeding, size of sport committees and

marketing. Obviously, it is a really big task, but one I think that the subcommittee manages very well. This subcommittee, like most of our subcommittees, spends a lot of time before actual meetings with conference calls or meeting the day before the actual meeting begins to review all the items that come before them so that we can move forward with our meeting process and have an informed opinion that has already been put in place by the bracket and format subcommittee.

The subcommittee reviews the recommendations of the governance sports committee. Those come to us on a regular basis throughout the cycle. We meet in September, February and June each year, so the sport committees know when our meetings are and they put together information they would like for us to review and hopefully improve in most cases. We also over the last year now have compiled all the historical data of when brackets have been expanded or when any major decision has been made with regard to any sport so that there is a historical perspective that we have when we look through and are making any decisions about whether it be bracket expansion or site selection, or whatever the case might be. We have some knowledge now. We have a historical perspective of how we got to where we got to, and we can make the decision following some of the historical data.

The championships philosophy, I think most of you are probably familiar with this, but I will review it with you. A fair and equitable championship should be created to provide national level competition among the best eligible student-athlete and teams of member institutions, also with consideration for approved regional structures in certain championships. We do have some championships that have a tendency to be more regional in nature, and we have some championships in some of our individual sports that are more regional in nature and their structures that those sport committees have put in place over the years are more regionally based. But for the most part, our team championships, probably with the exception of ice hockey, which has a tendency to be more regionally based, most of our championships are national in scope and involve all member conferences of the Association in Division I. Access to the championships shall be provided by a combination of automatic qualifiers and at-large selections.

The Cabinet previously approved the guidelines based on sponsorship percentages. Again, all of the decisions that were made with regard to bracket expansion came to us initially by a request from the CCA, which requested that we provide opportunities for student-athletes in all conferences, so that all conference champions would have access to the national championship. I think that most commissioners felt, and I think members and conferences that were not represented by an automatic qualifier, felt there were distinct disadvantages to their conferences and to their leagues by not having access to the championship, whether that be recruiting or in public image and perception, or whatever the case might be.

So one of the first goals of the Championships/Competition Cabinet was to put in place an opportunity for all conferences to be represented in the NCAA championships structure in all sports. I think we have pretty much achieved that at this point in time. I don't think we have a sport right now that we don't have every conference that sponsors a sport that doesn't have an automatic qualifier into an NCAA championship. The results of that have been very positive.

I think the other reason that we went the route of trying to provide more access or greater access, I don't remember the exact year, but from a historic perspective I want to say it was sometime in the late '90s, OCR came in and took a look at the opportunities that were available for women student-athletes with regard to the championships program, and through recommendations of the Committee on Women's Athletics and a directive again from the Board, we took a look at that and made some decisions to increase and enhance championship opportunities for women. Right now, we are probably at a 50-50 split of

championship opportunities for both men and women that the Association sponsors. Again, this will give you a little bit of historic perspective. As I told you, we certainly are very concerned about the academic impact on the participating institutions as well as the financial impact on the participating institutions and the NCAA.

We do not all have the same academic calendar, unfortunately, and I don't know if it will ever come to a point in time. I am sure that will be a great conversation for the Board of Directors to discuss it at some point in time. Obviously, the quarter systems and the semester systems, when we start school, has an impact on our championships program as it does for many of you with regard to your conference championships and our national championships program.

The effect of the 9-11-2001 tragedy interrupted the review and formulation of our championships models. We had begun the process up to that point in time. The Cabinet, after the tragedy occurred, approved the use of a regional championships model for the championships program due to travel and concerns. For the most part, this was well received by the membership. Candidly, there were some folks who were uncomfortable with it and felt that we in some shape or form were diminishing the opportunities for student-athletes. There was some concern certainly on the part of the Cabinet, and I think the Board of Directors with regard to the safety of our student-athletes. We didn't want to put them in a position to be targets in any way, shape or form and to minimize travel, for not only the student-athletes attending the championships but also our fans who have enjoyed them and that we have relied on to come to championships, to participate and cheer our teams, and also to be a part of the experience.

So we went to the Management Council and it eventually was approved by the Board that we would keep all the championships regional during the 2001 and 2002 academic year. Since that time, I think most of you know we have gone back where we were with the old format, given the tightening of security measures and the whole host of things that have been done. I think as Americans we probably feel a little bit more comfortable about travel and some of the safety concerns have been somewhat mitigated, although I think most of us probably are not naive enough to think that our country is still not on tense ground, and we are obviously very concerned about that.

With regard to our championships program and where we are headed, we really believe that we are in a better position to have returned back to the original way that we conducted our championships. The pairings and seeding models were considered. I would like at this point to turn this over to Bev Lewis. Bev has overseen the work of this subcommittee, which, as most of you can imagine, has been an arduous and tenuous task to deal with all of the championships and to review all of the brackets and formats of what each sport committee has presented to us. She has done an amazing and outstanding job. I am eternally grateful for the commitment and the work that she has put forward in doing this. I think you will see an education through the process of what we have gone through and how we got to where we are. You will have a tremendous appreciation for the work that she has done as well. Bev, if you would be so kind.

Beverly Lewis (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Thank you, Jeannie. When she first gave us that charge, we just kind of looked at her and said, "Is that all?" As you can see, it was very time-consuming. We really had to do a historical study to see where we were with each of the sports, what kind of variances there were between the sports, and where we should be heading.

As she mentioned, one of the first things we looked at was the field sizes and provided access to the championship for all conferences. We also wanted to ensure there was a balance and that 50 percent of the field was retained for at-large slots. I think we created a balance where all conferences had access but also we were able to retain 50 percent of the field in team sports for at-large qualifiers.

The bracket format committee was then asked to develop principles for some seeding, pairing and site selection. We did an historical review of all the sports championships. We examined the field sizes of each championship and how each championship seeded, paired and assigned the sites. We really found lots of variance. We had one sport that had a field of 16 and they were seeding all 16. We had some sports who were only seeding four to eight in a field of 48. We had one sport that was allowing the top eight seeds to stay at home, moving the bottom of the field. We had some who were seeding most of their field without regard to geography while other sports were looking strictly at geography when doing first-round match-ups. We had some sports avoiding conference match-ups in the first round or in the first two rounds and we had other sports that really were just looking at geography. It didn't matter if the conference teams had met two or three times during the season already; if geographically that was the way it fell, that was the way the committee was doing it.

So there was really a lot of variance between what the committees were doing. We then reviewed all those different procedures that the committees were following and came up with four models. We came up with four different models that we wanted to look at. We asked the NCAA staff to show us what four or five championships from the previous year would look like if they were seeded by each model. I am going to walk you through the models.

You can see Model No. 1, the first seeding of the entire bracket, seeding all teams and pairing accordingly. For example, No. 1 playing No. 64, and No. 2 playing No. 63; more or less the basketball model. The next model, Model No. 2, the band concept. This would be for example, in a 64-team bracket, the top 16 teams would be seeded and separated and the remaining teams would be seeded in groups or bands of 16 each. One from each band would be with one of the top 16 seeds. For example, No. 2 seeds would be Nos. 17 through 32. No. 3 seeds would be Nos. 33 through 48, and No. 4 seeds would be Nos. 49 through 64. Then a No. 1, 2, 3 and 4 seed would be assigned to each site according to geography.

We looked at baseball's model and this was somewhat of a variation of what baseball was doing. In Model No. 3, we wanted to create a model somewhere between Models 1 and 2. Look at the approved number of teams that would be seeded and placed in the bracket. The rest of the teams would be seeded according to geography. Model No. 4 strictly is a regional model. In this model, all teams would be selected and then assigned within their own region.

Those were the four models that we looked at. The NCAA staff then showed us what various championships from the previous year would look like under each model and they ran a cost estimate for each scenario. So, we were able to look at what we had—baseball, volleyball, softball. We had a number of championships that we looked at and saw what the field would look like and who they would be playing under each of these four scenarios. Also, the Cabinet at that time heard presentations from the commissioners of the Big Ten and the Big Twelve who had differing views regarding seeding and site assignment and site selection. We also got responses from several sport committees.

The sport committees that we ran the scenarios by, we wanted them to take a look at it and give us feedback on what they thought of each scenario. The sport committees were pretty much in consensus that Model 4 would not be good for creating a fair championship. They didn't like the regional model. In fact, as you can probably guess, most of the sport committees leaned towards being able to seed more teams. What the subcommittee then came up with was identifying Models 2 and 3 as the most appropriate for Division I championships, to maintain a competitive championship while recognizing travel time and cost impact.

We didn't consider the men's and women's basketball for any type of change. As Jeannie mentioned, apart from our study and while we were conducting our review, we had the 9-11 travel policies come into place for a year. This did result, as most of you know, in some

cost savings as a result of the reduction in air travel. After that, at least one conference office and the NCAA staff brought to our attention Bylaw 31.1.3.2.6. Jeannie will discuss that bylaw with you.

Ms. Ponsetto: Most of you who have served on sport committees are probably aware of this. That was a little disconcerting to find out that we had a few sport committees, and probably more than any of us would like to acknowledge, that were operating outside of what had been approved by the Association without any form of a waiver. How that happened or why it happened, I am not sure that any of us really know. That aside, we felt that we had a responsibility that was given to us by the membership to make sure if there was a bylaw that was put in place by the Association that the championships program adhere to that bylaw, that we try to find out why people weren't, or whether or not they were granted any sort of waiver from the old Executive Committee or at some point in time whether or not the Championships Cabinet had given them that approval.

As Bev said, there was some consternation amongst the membership. As we moved forward and we were able to go back and create the historic perspective by looking at all the old sport committee meetings, we found that there were some approvals that had been granted. I think there was a comfort level about the fact that we were going to be proceeding with regard to some championships without having to make any drastic changes. At the same time, we did have to go back to a couple of sport committees and say we have no historic perspective or we have no historic data that would allow you to continue the way that you have in the past. As you could well imagine, in a championship like men's and women's tennis that had been conducting their championships a certain way for two or three years, for the Cabinet to come back now and tell them what you have been doing has never been approved and you are acting outside the bylaw was not likely going to be well received. And it wasn't.

Many of you who had teams that were affected by us asking a sport committee to go back and take a look at how it will affect your championship if you adhered to the bylaw. We were obviously confronted with a lot of letters and a lot of comments from conference offices and from commissioners about how we could go back and change. I would like to take you through the bylaw to see what it says. It says in championships that do not generate net revenue, pairings shall be based merely on the team's geographical proximity to one another regardless of the region in order to avoid air travel in preliminary rounds, whenever possible. That was the bylaw that we had been operating under. The bylaw has been revised, but the intent of it was the same. That is, as the teams were being seeded and paired into brackets, those championships that did not generate revenue, which were a good number of our championships, were acting outside that or were seeding teams in some cases nationally. That has a great effect in sports like men's and women's tennis and men's and women's golf where the institutions incur the cost for first- and second-round play. Obviously, we are in a position now where we are trying to get our arms around this and trying to manage it in another way.

One of the things we decided to do was to go back to all the sport committees and ask what they would like for us to do this year. They know what we did last year. In some cases—I-AA football, for example—they said what we did last year after the 9-11 circumstances worked for us. We would like to have an opportunity to reallocate some of those dollars and put more games on television. That made sense to the Cabinet. They wanted their championship to be more regional in scope. So the Cabinet approved that. At the same time, we had other sport committees like volleyball that came back to us and said we have been seeding teams 1 through 64 for a good number of years. We feel like that is what our membership expects. We would like to continue to do that if at all possible. We approved that.

One of the things we decided not to do this year because we were undergoing this review

is to not have to do one thing for the 2001-2002 championships and something else for 2003 and make another recommendation for 2003-04. In most cases, we allowed all the sports that had been operating outside of the bylaw to continue what they had been doing before 9-11. At this point in time, we have gone back to all the sport committees to ask what works best. You are the experts. We would like to hear from a philosophical standpoint. We have given you a couple of models. How does your championship measure up with the models we have outlined and with the philosophy that we have put in place so that we could deal with this and manage it in a better way for the future and also have something that is in line with a championship's philosophy that we think the Association would embrace and that folks would support?

With regard to the team seeding situation, was team seeding relative to one another taken into consideration when establishing pairings if such pairings do not result in air travel that otherwise could be avoided? Again, a similar bylaw situation we have been dealing with in trying to avoid travel for teams that is obviously costly, but at the same time now put ourselves in a position where we wouldn't allow our top teams to be able to advance to the championship. Site-selection clarification for multiple-team sites. Sites must be selected that result in the least amount of air travel. These are again interpretations of the bylaw and for championships that do not generate revenue.

Bev is going to take you back through the working principles that the subcommittee has been working on and that for the most part at this point in time the Cabinet has endorsed. As we get toward the end of our presentation, we will be looking to you for feedback on a variety of these items. I will turn it back over to Bev to discuss the working principles.

Ms. Lewis: The next thing we tried to do after looking at the models and after leaning towards Models 2 and 3, we then wanted to come up with some working principles that we were going to give back to the sport committees to get their feedback on and say here are some guidelines for all of our championships.

Working Principle No. 1. The subcommittee felt that the top team should be seeded and we selected no more than 25 percent of the bracket except for those brackets in which 25 percent is not practical. For example, allowing a 48-team bracket to seed 16 rather than the top 12. That was our starting point. We decided the top team should be seeded.

Working Principle No. 2. We felt that first-round conference match-ups should be avoided. First round was defined as the first contest.

Principle No. 3. We felt that higher-seeded teams should be given consideration in hosting. Other factors that would be considered would be missed class time, the quality and availability of the facility and other necessary accommodations, attendance history, financial considerations, geography, quality of the student-athlete experience, championship atmosphere, and accessibility of fans.

So we felt that the higher-seeded teams should be given preference, but we wanted to give the sport committees other criteria to look at when evaluating the sites.

Working Principle No. 4. After seeding the approved number of teams, we felt that the teams should be placed in brackets geographically per Bylaw 31.1.3.2.6, with consideration then given to missed class time, the quality of the student-athlete's experience, championship atmosphere and the accessibility of fans.

I think you saw how our men's basketball championship came back to wanting to have, when it got down to it, some of the teams competing closer to home for accessibility to fans. I think we felt after you have taken care of the top seeds and spread out the field and allowed them some consideration in hosting, then we would look at the rest of the bracket and be able to do some geographical pairings. We are still trying to balance how this all fits in with the bylaw and where the bylaw comes into play. I think what Jeannie is going to end up telling you is where we are now and what our process is for the future.

Ms. Ponsetto: Thanks, Bev. As I mentioned to you before all the championships for the 2002-03 year, we have returned to the same formats they were using prior to 9-11. We have gone back to the way we used to do our business, so we would not create any sort of an error that we were retreating or retrenching without having done a full review. We felt it was prudent judgment on our part to go back to the way we used to do things. We had done homework and had a thorough review in place and could go back to both the Management Council and the Board of Directors and say here is what we found and here is what our sport committees are feeling. Obviously, we can take input from groups like this as well.

We have gone back to our sport committees and asked them to tell us what you think works best. We have had some experience. We have created all the historical data. We have looked at the finances and we are obviously trying to be fiscally responsible as well as provide an opportunity for the best teams that have the greatest opportunity to advance to the national championship without impeding them in any way. We are concerned about the quality of the experience for the student-athletes. Tell us what that means in terms of site selection and things like that. While a great number of folks feel it is important that the top-seeded teams get to host, I think that most of us who have gone to the NCAA championships don't feel very compelled to have top teams host when they don't sell the championship or when they are not able to sell a championship.

I think that is obviously a very divergent view for some folks, and not everybody shares that philosophy. We have gotten information back from teams that have gone to championships that have not been well promoted or well received. There obviously has been some concern on the part of the Cabinet. Should we automatically be granting top seeds the opportunity to host in every championship? We will review that in our February meeting. We will have an opportunity to get feedback. Most of it has come into us. As a matter of fact, those of you in the conference offices have our meeting materials and have seen what has come back to us and what the subcommittee will review at our next meeting. We will go in the day before and have an opportunity to take a look at all the recommendations that were made. Some will ask for status quo. Some will in some way, shape or form comply with what we have asked them to do in terms of Model 2 or Model 3, and what works best for their championship. That feedback is vitally important to the work that we will continue to do. We do anticipate that we are going to finish this by June of this year. That has been our goal and my hope at this point in time because Bev has informed me today she is getting ready to go on the Management Council and is probably going to leave the Championships Cabinet. We can have most of this work done after our February meeting. She has done an outstanding job with them and I wouldn't want her not to be able to finish under her other watch. At this point in time we are encouraging feedback.

We would really like to know what folks think about the overall championship philosophy, if it is about a certain sport, and if you feel strongly about the way the championship should be conducted for a certain sport. We certainly would like to have that from the membership. We have gotten that from the conference offices. We have received it from all of the sport committees at this point in time. We have one or two that we are still waiting for, but for the most part we are looking to make this a broad and comprehensive review and hopefully let everyone have an opportunity to provide us with their input.

We want the decisions that do get made or do get moved up the ladder to the Management Council and the Board of Directors to come with some level of consensus on the part of the membership so people feel good about what we are doing or feel good about the process and that everybody has an opportunity to participate. Our liaisons—Judy, Dave, Tom Jacobs and Wayne Burrow are here today. You can e-mail those guys or drop them a line or do whatever you think is necessary. We would like to have feedback by February 3. We would like to have that information because we are planning to move for-

ward after our February meeting with some recommendations to the Management Council about where we want to go and how we want to take this to the next level so we can be responsible on how we have managed the dollars that have been allocated to us.

It is time to take questions or comments. If anybody doesn't understand anything we have said, we will be happy to certainly answer any questions.

Betsy Stephenson (University of California, Los Angeles): I have a question in terms of the student-athlete experience. Has there been any thought given to surveying the student-athletes who participate in our championships and giving them different scenarios such as whether it is preferable for them to stay close to home so their parents can see them play, or if it is important to have the seeding be paramount in the championships structure? I know it would be very complicated to explain how we seed and select teams to a student-athlete. I think they are very interested when they get to the championship level about an equitable playing field.

Ms. Ponsetto: That is a good idea. We could certainly do that. We can do it through the SAAC. We have heard from different coaches groups. The information that we get from them varies. I think it depends on which side of the fence that you have been on. I think that for the most part, anybody who goes to a championship site and there are behinds in the seats feels good about that championship experience. It also helps to stay in a hotel with a restaurant in it. Those are some of the nuts and bolts things and some of the feedback that the championships staff gets back from surveying student-athletes at the end of each championship. We ask for one student-athlete from each team who participated in the championship to fill out a survey in addition to the coach and usually the administrator who is on site. We do have some of that back. So the mindset about quality of experience for the student-athletes comes from some of the historical data we have gotten from student-athletes that said I was at such and such a site and our hotel was really bad. It was an hour away and there was no restaurant, or my parents couldn't come because it was 1,000 miles away from our campus. So we have got some of that kind of feedback. Have we done a blanket survey where we have taken each side that has participated in the championship and asked? No. We do have one survey from each team that is from a student-athlete who participated on the team. That is how we have got to the quality of experience component of this because we have gotten some feedback from the kids that has been a little disconcerting in terms of their experience. If it has been at a championship site where they felt there has been excitement and there has been atmosphere and there have been people there and they have been able to stay in a nice hotel, candidly, that is really pretty positive feedback. It is when they have not had that quality of experience that we get back comments that say my conference championship was more fun. There were more people at our conference championship than at the national championship. We are trying to create an atmosphere at the national championship that is a level up from most people's conference championships.

Richard Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): Jean, I would like to commend the Cabinet for the work they have done in opening access to all conference champions. I think it is very important. I know in the MAAC it is important that student-athletes have a post-season opportunity. We certainly commend that.

I have two somewhat related questions. What work is being done in terms of standardizing the play-in process for different championships? I know some work has been done on that. I think it is still pretty much committee by committee with some general oversight. As an institution and a conference that hosts many championships, we have run into a problem with the required insurances that we have to provide the NCAA. I think that needs to be looked at. We are getting hammered on that since the post 9-11 world. Since we take that out of our honorariums, that's becoming an increasingly expensive item, especially on the championships that have marginal revenue. I would like you to take that into consideration. Thank you.

Ms. Ponsetto: Bev has got a good answer for you.

Ms. Lewis: On the play-ins we did address that and put some policies in place, along with providing access to the conference champions. We also retained 50 percent of the field for at larges. We put criteria in place where if 60 percent of the membership sponsor a certain team sport, all eligible conferences would be given the automatic qualification up to a maximum of 50 percent of the bracket being filled, at which time if access was not available to all other eligible conferences, we would be expanding to additional opening rounds. Then we went to if there were 10 to 59 percent of the membership sponsoring this sport, that we would create access by having plans. So we tried to put some kind of policy in place so it was not a subjective sport committee by sport committee.

Ms. Ponsetto: Rich, I am not sure how many play-ins we still have. I think we still have them in field hockey. There are not many championships that we still have them in. You probably know off the top of your head more than we do.

Play-ins, as I think most people in the room know, certainly the CCA members, were originally formatted by the CCA. I am assuming there has been some inconsistency in the way it has been managed from conference to conference. I think that, obviously, has caused some problems. We tried with our policies to put in place a structure that eliminates a play-in by granting everybody automatic qualification when we could, as Bev has described. There has been some discussion about whether or not the Association should pay for those play-ins and then should also oversee them. I think that would take some legislative action by the membership in order for us to be able to do that. It certainly is an option that would be available, but it would probably put us in a better position or lend some greater consistency on how the play-ins are managed and conducted from conference to conference and from championship to championship.

I am going to turn the insurance question over to Judy. She is in a better position to answer that.

Judith Sweet (NCAA Staff): That question has been brought forward to the finance department at the NCAA as part of the overall review of insurance for the future. So it will be reviewed, Rich. Thank you.

Barbara Camp (Auburn University): Along this same line of expenses, with the expansion of brackets and sports, is the NCAA looking at the possibility of the regionals and those first-round championships in sports like tennis and golf for reimbursement for some of those issues in the future?

Ms. Ponsetto: That is an item that is on our agenda, Barb, but we will probably not do that until after we complete this work. I think we need to find out what this current process is. Whatever it is we decide to do is going to cost us, and whether or not we can do that within the dollars that have been allocated to us. Rich has brought this to us before and has written me a letter asking that the Championships/Competition Cabinet consider paying for all rounds of all championship in cross country, in men's and women's tennis, in men's and women's golf, gymnastics, and some of the other sports where we currently do not reimburse institutions.

Candidly, that is where some of the issues came in with the bylaw. We did have some concern on the part of conferences and institutions where a golf team would be sent from Wisconsin to Oregon for a first-round competition. The sport committee was trying to preserve the integrity of their championship. But it really was outside of what the bylaw permitted. I cite that as an example. This is something that is currently on our list of things to do. I think until we finish this review and know what this is going to cost us, we are not going to be in a position to do that. That will add to how we spend our dollars in those championships.

Lisa Love (University of Southern California): I have got a few questions. Do either one

of you need any more information from other sport committees before February 3, or do you feel like you have got it under hand?

Ms. Ponsetto: I think we have what we need from the sport committees. We would like feedback from conferences and institutions. We have heard from a couple of conferences and some institutions. If there is an opinion that is out there that we have not heard yet, call us, or Tom, Wayne, Judy, or Dave, or you can e-mail myself or Bev. We would like to have it before February 1 because we are going to convene on February 3 so we can organize the material and have it ready for our subcommittee.

Ms. Love: You have got from the sport committees a great deal of feedback about a desire to want to seed more rather than less?

Ms. Ponsetto: In some cases. We have got just the opposite in baseball. We put in place a model for baseball. Baseball is comfortable with seeding eight. It works for them, and they have the flexibility within the philosophy they could seed up to 16. But their championship has been hugely successful with the way they have managed the concept. I think one of the things we are starting to or have seen is that while men's basketball seeds all 64 teams, I think they have looked to go to more of a geographical model that really helps their attendance with their pod concept. I suspect that the same may be true with women's basketball as they have gone to predetermined sites for their championships. They may become a little more geographical in nature. I would be hard pressed to say that everybody wants to seed more teams.

I think there are some championships that have a 64-team bracket that seed only eight and would like to seed more and go to 16. The philosophy would allow them to do that. There are championships like field hockey with a 16-team bracket, but would like to seed all 16 instead of the four we have recommended. What is appropriate for that sport is what we will determine. I would be hard pressed to say across the board everybody wants to seed more teams. I think we have seen that in the smaller championships. Ice hockey and field hockey are the two that come to mind right now, in which they are looking to seed more teams in their smaller field.

Ms. Love: For those who would like to seed more than a quarter of the bracket, is it appropriate for the subcommittee to consider a working principle for those kinds of sports? Is a non-revenue sport going to be the limiting mechanism toward seeding and making this only a quarter percent of the bracket? Is there a principle towards that? Just out of curiosity, what is the formula from the staff that determines net revenue? What all goes in the pie to determine net revenue for any particular championship?

I'm looking for some kind of incentive and understanding of that budget that would help motivate the sport committees toward some kind of relaxation of being under the umbrella of that bylaw and being able to move towards more seeding rather than the quarter percent. A general concern by sport committees is the volleyball committee particularly in terms of redundancy in national championship competition by just playing your neighbor or your conference opponent again and again, year after year after year, and that quality of experience. So you are just looking for a little bit of leeway.

Unfortunately, the volleyball committee must have miscommunicated to you about seeding and how many the volleyball committee has been seeding, because we haven't been seeding 64. We have just been seeding 16 and then working some kind of a regional concept within the rest of the field. I wanted to make sure that I made that clear.

Ms. Ponsetto: Thank you. I think there are a couple of other things that could probably happen in the interim steps, Lisa, with regard to the whole revenue question of how the revenue gets counted. I think any sport committee that comes to us with a recommendation of what is in their best interest, I think the Cabinet will move forward with it and look at how it measures up with the philosophy. It can certainly go to the broader membership

when it goes to the Management Council. I think there are a couple of things that can certainly happen along the way. One of them is a waiver of the bylaw. If volleyball were to ask for a waiver of the bylaws, a sport that either doesn't generate revenue or whatever, they determine what that revenue quotient is and Judy can say how revenue is determined. It is certainly an opportunity to ask for a waiver of the bylaw if that is what you want to do, and that could happen on an annual basis. If it was something that we looked at in the two- or three-year cycle, or something like that, if volleyball has an opportunity to generate more revenue, I think that is certainly an option that I would see available to any sport committee. With regard to your comment about seeding 64 teams, when we sat down with staff and went through it, it appeared as though teams were placed in the bracket based more on a seeding principle than on a geographical principle.

So I apologize to you if that is the perception that all 64 teams were seeded but when we sat with staff and looked at the comparison of how teams were placed in the bracket, it appeared as though they had been placed more by a seeding number as opposed to their geographical region, which resulted in a lot of air transportation compared to some other championships like men's and women's soccer.

Do you want to answer the revenue question, Judy?

Judith Sweet (NCAA Staff): The question regarding net revenue is all revenue generated, not including television, minus all expenses, which would include game expenses as well as all travel expenses.

Betsy Stephenson (University of California, Los Angeles): I realize this is bracket and format, but we have had this dialogue over time. A marketing subcommittee has been created to talk about putting people in the stands, the quality experience, the issue of predetermined versus non-predetermined and how long you have to promote a championship, and access for the general student body for a price versus free admission. You might just mention that. It is all related.

Ms. Ponsetto: We do have a subcommittee that is looking at a whole host of issues, most of which Betsy just mentioned—branding, licensing and promotion. That subcommittee is chaired by Linda Bruno. One of our concerns is that the membership probably has an expectation on the part of the staff to help us market our championships better. There are some sports who have made recommendations to go to more of a predetermined site format and follow the model that men's basketball has used so they will have an opportunity to secure quality hotels in advance and be able to sell tickets in advance of the championships, thereby enhancing the quality of the experience for student-athletes.

We probably will have some results here pretty quickly because women's basketball has gone to that format. We will find out after this year's championship how successful that was. The women's basketball committee put out for bid a process for predetermined sites and has awarded those predetermined sites. We will start to create some history and see if that is the route to go in more of our championships to create atmosphere and generate revenue. We think that level of interest is important in imaging not just our championships program, but our institutions and the Association as a whole.

Christine Hoyles (Pacific-10 Conference): This is a question for Judy. Based on your explanation of the revenue, is there any thought to attributing any of the television or marketing money to the specific sports that actually receive exposure? For example, softball, which was highly rated when it was on. Has that been given thought in order to help other sports approach being a revenue sport and to give them the flexibility that Lisa was describing?

Ms. Sweet: Chris, I think that has been discussed several times. All of the money generated goes back into the central Association funds to support all championships and educational programs.

Ms. Hoyles: On a related budget question, I am on the Cabinet so I know the answer to some of those questions.

Ms. Sweet: Are you testing us, Chris? (Laughter)

Ms. Hoyles: In terms of how the championships budget increases, because Jeannie has referred to it a few times, we want to look at the cost of the whole time and need to balance fairness in the championships with fiscal responsibility. How is the championship budget increased and what are the projections for how much it is going to increase as the general television money in the pot climbs over the next few years?

Ms. Sweet: In my two years of experience, my understanding is that the Executive Committee determines an allocation for Division I overall. A very large percentage of that overall Division I budget increase has gone to the championships program in the past two years. I believe, and David, maybe you can help with this, that two years ago it was \$2 million. This past year it was about \$1 million.

David Berst (NCAA Staff): I think all of that is correct. Actually, the schedule of the distribution over the course of the television contract has basically already been agreed to and the Board of Directors in Division I has acted on the money that relates to Division I initiatives. Although what you said is correct, we are now in a mode whereby it appears that over the next several years the money available for the Division I initiatives that is unallocated is around \$1 million each year.

Ms. Ponsetto: We are at a two-year budget now. I can tell you having brought the Cabinet's request before the Budget Committee, it has been very well received. Thankfully, we have had the support of the Management Council, and that certainly has helped us. We have probably gotten 90 to 95 percent of the budgeted dollars. The championships program has gotten 90 to 95 percent of the championships dollars allocated to the championships program, whether it be for expansion. We got a big bump this past year for—I think I am correct on this—bringing the per diem up to a level that was a little more reasonable and met with the cost of living that some of us had experienced.

We have also looked at a couple of things. Our travel subcommittee—I didn't want to get too far off the beaten path here—looked at things like what hotel costs are and how much those vary from not only championship to championship, but more within the same championship depending on where a team gets sent and how that cuts into an institution's per diem and whether or not they are able to cover their costs for hotel and feeding their team for what we have given them for per diem.

We have financial issues other than what Rich and Bev have raised—paying for other rounds of championship sports that we currently don't right now. We certainly have got some other ideas on how to spend the money and what has been allocated to us. Either we have done some reallocation within our own resources or we have gone and asked the Board for new dollars from the Division I allocation. We have been very well received and have been given those dollars. I think in a program like championships where it affects a large number of the student-athletes, the Board has been very receptive to providing us with some support.

Ms. Lewis: Jeannie, I would add in line that with our principles we recommended for next year, and it has moved on, that the men's and women's soccer and softball be able to seed more teams, moving them toward seeding the 16, which is in line with our 25 percent, and that soccer be able to avoid the first-round conference match-ups because we did have conference teams meeting each other after they had played two or three times. Those were a few we felt were in line and are in the process of coming into being.

Don DiJulia (St. Joseph's University): Can you tell which Division I championships currently receive net revenue based on Judy's explanation of that? Do you know if any Divisions II or III championships have net revenue based on a similar formula?

Ms. Ponsetto: We don't think there are any Divisions II or III championships. Division I, obviously, men's basketball, men's baseball, men's wrestling, men's ice hockey. I think those are the four—men's lacrosse. I think those are the four championships that have generated revenue up to this point in time. We have had on occasion men's soccer, but not in the last couple of years.

Ms. Lewis: Let me add one more thing. For your information, the Pac-10 has another proposal out there that we have not dealt with. It's basically talking about site selection and recommending that financial guarantees not be a sole reason the committee can select the site. I think there was a concern that there was a bidding process going on in one or two particular sports for a championship, and that higher-seeded teams are given priority in the site-selection process. That is one amendment that has been floating out there that the Cabinet has not dealt with yet because we were going through this process.

Ms. Ponsetto: Thanks, Bev. Any other questions or comments? We would certainly encourage that if you do that you please forward them to one of us, or to Tom or Wayne at the national office. We would like to have again the feedback and the process to be as inclusive as possible. Please take every opportunity to provide us with that.

On behalf of the Cabinet, I want to thank everybody for being here today and for your input. Thank you.

Mr. Bates: Thank you, Jeannie and Bev. (Applause)

Academic Reform Forum

Mr. Bates: We are now entering our third and final forum for the morning. This forum will include an update and discussion of the academic reform efforts. Additionally, it will include an update on adopted legislation, as well as an update on the academic progress rate. Lastly, this session will include a discussion regarding the development of the incentives and disincentives. We are looking forward at this time to a lively and spirited meeting. Our presenters this morning are Kevin Lennon, vice-president for membership services; Diane Dickman, managing director of membership services; Todd Petr, director of research; Todd Turner, director of athletics at Vanderbilt University; Jim Castaneda, faculty rep at Rice University, and finally Fran Lawrence, a former president at Rutgers who has given tremendous leadership to the Board of Directors task force on this issue. So with that I will turn it over to Kevin.

Kevin Lennon (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Percy, and welcome everyone to the Division I Academic Reform Forum. He did a nice job of outlining the agenda. I want to highlight a couple of things. It is our hope that we can share with you the recent activity regarding phase one of academic reform. As you are aware, this past October, the Board of Directors adopted a significant set of enhancements to our initial-eligibility and progress-toward-degree requirements. We want to share with you that information. We want to hear at the end of the session your comments and response regarding those proposals. Hearing the discussion today, I have heard each of you think about what this is going to mean to you from a campus and conference perspective. We hope we can save at least an hour for that type of discussion at the end of the session today. I would ask from the outset that we have an opportunity to simply work our way through all of the materials. Each of you has a copy of the Power Points we are going to use today. It may be beneficial if we are able to present the information to you and then save that large chunk of time at the end of this morning's discussion to hear your thoughts about what has been done, what is about to be done and to focus on what this means for you back on your campus. We think that would be quite instructive. Diane Dickman will talk a little bit about some of the proposals that are in the process right now related to standards. Todd Petr will update you on academic progress

made. Todd Turner, who is the chair of the Division I management working group that is looking at incentives and disincentives, will bring you up to speed on the work of that group. Then we will finish with some information and hear back from you in terms of feedback that you want to provide.

It is with great pleasure that I introduce to you today Fran Lawrence. Fran has served as the chair of the Division I Board of Directors task force, has provided as Percy noted, tremendous leadership to that group, specifically related to academic reform. His steady hand in this work has been invaluable to the group and invaluable to intercollegiate athletics. Without further ado, I introduce Fran Lawrence.

Fran Lawrence: Thank you, and welcome to this meeting. As I am sure you know, we have been working at this since the summer of 2001. We've been working on academic reform at the presidential level not only since that time but will be until a whole look at reform is completed. The reasons for our review of this particular issue can go back to a number of points. The NCAA has always been committed to study the impact of our rules on young people. We are disappointed with the graduation rate in some sports, particularly men's basketball.

We know that we can and must do better in the future. We have without any doubt the best data available to make decisions. This is why we have been so relentless in studying the impact of the rules, so that whatever decisions are made can be data driven. Recent favorable legal decisions have also cleared the way on a number of issues that we are looking at. If you will remember, in 1999 the Board gave a charge to a group of academic consultants to examine the rules and data and suggest to us appropriate changes that will maximize graduation rates while minimizing adverse impact on the African-American and low-income communities.

We were pleased that the consultants met our charge. In fact, it became clear that in order to meet this charge we could not only focus on increasing academic expectations of high school and college student-athletes, we needed to increase the expectations and accountability of our colleges and coaches. The Board adopted a resolution, which is a multi-phase road map for reform. This resolution laid the foundation for the academic reform package. I underline the word "package." It was not simply one issue, an issue of initial eligibility. It is a package. We stayed focused on that word "package" until our work was completed.

The Board's resolution clearly expresses our desire to enhance the academic standards for our young people. We do this by recently adopted enhancement of the progress towards degree, rates and by changes to the initial-eligibility standards. We also sought to improve the measurements of academic success through the creation of an annual academic progress rate and the NCAA graduation success rate. We encouraged academic performance of all sports teams by giving incentive and disincentive structures that will reward teams and penalize those that are not successful at the level we believe they should be.

We examined the kinds of demands placed on student-athletes so that they can be successful in meeting the new standards. You are going to hear a lot of detail this morning about the academic reform package from the other speakers. I want to emphasize again that we are very serious about reform and with good reason. Why? Because there is a real problem that exists and we need real and effective responses to this problem. Our commitment must be to our student-athletes. This is one that is expected of all of us, no matter what role we play within the university or in the NCAA, and it is required by our admission with higher education.

I can tell you that over the time I have been on the Board, I am utterly convinced that all the presidents I have spoken to on the Board and off the Board are very serious about what their responsibility is on this particular matter. Last year at this time, we handed out

a mission statement for Division I. It has been revised, and we take that seriously. The committee and the Board do not plan simply to tinker with current rules and regulations. We intend to substantially reform, to change the current culture. We are serious and we will be vigorous in our effort to ensure that students are on track to graduate and we have a way to measure that graduation success. That is the main message I am trying to deliver on behalf of my colleagues this morning.

I am going to turn it back over to Kevin. You will get a presentation of some of the things we have been talking about and what has been passed.

Mr. Lennon: Thank you, Fran. As we focused on phase one of the academic reform package, those issues focused on our expectations for young people. As Fran has noted, only those specifically relate to the standards for eligibility. I think most of you are aware of what was done this past October and what will begin to be implemented this coming fall. Perhaps the most significant component of that is the enhanced progress-toward-degree requirement. The 60-40-80 is the percentage of degrees that needs to be completed at the start of years three, four and five, along with a grade-point average requirement.

Basically, this was data driven again. As we examined the academic profile of graduates with graduation being the ultimate outcome, it became clear that if we use the benchmarks of what academic graduates looked like as our graduates for eligibility standards, that we would put our student-athletes in a much better position to receive their degrees. That has been the framework with which these progress degree standards have been formulated. In addition, there is a desire to continue to increase the academic expectations for those students, and it is done primarily through asking them to take one additional core course. We will talk about potential increases for that requirement, but this is a step in increasing our expectations for high-school students in the classroom.

Finally, identifying the more appropriate use of the test scores continues to remain a part of the initial-eligibility standards. There is a clear commitment to continue to use the test scores, but with the new extended sliding scale more appropriately using the test scores in that eligibility equation. As many of you are aware, there are other components perhaps less dramatic that have been adopted in terms of reducing the number of remedial hours during the freshman year and the hourly requirements of six hours per term in order to retain eligibility and the like. We will not spend a lot of time on that today, and we can certainly pick that up in the Q and A.

There are a couple of issues that are on your screen right now, one relating to frequency of GPA checks. The Board of Directors directed the Management Council and the academic consultants to forward legislation requiring more frequent GPA checks. What was passed was a one-time grade-point average. The Board has been very specific and has charged the academic bodies to come back and give further examination to that with the potential of examining grade-point average twice a year or in every term. That would be something that I would be quite interested in. I know the Board as well would be interested in hearing your reactions to that at this forum today. I want to make sure you are aware of additional areas of study. Again, going beyond 14 core courses. The Board is very specific in continuing to look at what impact increasing beyond the 14 core courses would have in the academic preparedness of our high-school students. Perhaps that number is 15, 16. Give us some information that we can evaluate. Give us some information on the impact of potentially increasing the core grades, raising the bar, if you will, in terms of the GPA and the test-score requirements. What would that do to our high-school students? All of that is with an eye toward the report going to the Board this coming April.

The last aspect I want to touch on before I turn it over to Diane would be an update on the phase two activities. These are significant and Fran had noted this when he talked about the academic package of reform. The annual academic progress rate with the incen-

tives/disincentives graduation rate are currently topics being pursued aggressively within the NCAA structure. I want to give you a little sense of the time line and a little sense of pace. I think this plays well with those who were considering this in the first session about the legislative process. It is our hope that the people working in these areas will be in a position by late spring or early summer to circulate white papers, if you will, to the membership for your spring and summer meetings that conceptually will outline how these concepts all fit together.

We have heard loud and clear that you want to better understand what the rate is and how we will evaluate an annual academic assessment of academic performance with incentives and disincentives. We recognize that need and are working towards that end. We hope that this spring and summer will give you an opportunity for meaningful comment back on these proposals so that the Board can have that information as it continues to consider this information during its August meeting. All of that is with an eye toward an October 2003 Management Council review in which they would be able to look at these specific proposals in the legislative form. That would then allow for a comment period to continue. It would be our thought that the Convention next year would be filled with discussion regarding the impact of the new rate and the incentives and disincentives, or another opportunity for meaningful dialogue all with an eye toward an April 2004 vote of the Board of Directors.

That is the plan. It is fairly ambitious and it is going to require all of you to continue to pay attention to each critical issue and use your spring and summer meetings as a significant opportunity for that kind of comment. That is enough data on phase two in sense of the time line.

With that, I would like to turn it over to Diane Dickman, who will share with you some of the ongoing issues that are currently in the legislative process. Diane.

Diane Dickman (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Kevin. Good morning, everyone. As many of you are aware, there are currently five legislative academic proposals that are out for membership comment that is anticipated by the Management Council and Board this coming April.

The first of those relates to the initial-eligibility rule that a student-athlete will be subject to upon entering a collegiate institution. This provision specifies that the student-athlete shall meet the initial-eligibility requirements at the time of their enrollment full-time into a collegiate institution. The current Bylaw 14.3.1.4 permits them to use a high-school graduation requirement or the year they may enter full-time enrollment. The main point of this proposal is cost reduction and eliminating the need to continue to operate and report out all of the decisions of the clearinghouse related to every rule change that has occurred since the clearinghouse began operation in 1994 and will continue to change in Division I, the cost to maintain them and provide the mechanism to report out all those different rules.

Proposal 02-69 relates to the students with learning disabilities. That is matching the percent of degree required to earn the four-years of competition to the aid of the 40-80 rule. That rule is 75 percent and narrows the 25-75 legislation.

Proposal 02-70, particularly what is given by the Board of Directors' request for academics, which has the new academic legislation, could be held to current student-athletes who are already enrolled in their institution as opposed to students who had been entering your institution in the fall of those three. This is one proposal which identifies the students, the requirements that students earn six hours per term, and that the enrollment could be applied to currently enrolled student-athletes—sophomores, juniors, seniors. If this proposal was adopted, your student-athletes who are continuing in their role after the fall, would be required in that fall term to earn six hours of academic study.

Proposal 02-66 is a similar provision that requires graduate students to earn their

undergraduate degree. Those who have earned their baccalaureate degree, but continue to have eligibility remaining, would need to earn six hours per term as well.

The final proposal for membership comment is 02-68. This relates to two-year college transfers who are qualifiers and permits two-year college transfers who are qualifiers to be eligible if they need to meet the provisions of each as you see on the screen in front of you. They must have been full-time in college for at least one term of enrollment and have a 2.02 grade-point average and 12 hours of transferable degree credits. Those students who were a qualifier upon transfer to the four-year institution, their academic transcript would be required to look exactly like the students who came originally to the institution as a freshman. After that first term, they would have 12 hours of credit earned that could, in fact, be more than your prior fall that came initially to your institution. So the sense that these are qualifying students who could have originally come to a four-year institution and have been immediately eligible bringing with them 12 transfer degree credits, and that they should be eligible to participate in the transfer.

With that, I will turn it over to Todd Petr.

Todd Petr (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Diane. I want to talk briefly where we are right now with the annual academic progress rate and development of that range.

A subcommittee of the Cabinet consultants met about a month ago to start getting into the nuts and bolts of this particular rate. You will notice that we are trying to access year by year the academic progress of the student-athletes so we don't have to wait for six years to get a graduation rate as we do currently. The goals of this rate will be simple, fair and defensible, for what is legally defensible.

We need a real time assessment of academic performance unlike the current graduation rate, which has a six-year delay. We are looking at a measure that will be applied to every team at all Division I institutions. It will be sort of a team-by-team look at academic success. The five major issues that confronted the group that met in December are on this particular slide. First of all, what population of student-athletes should serve as a base for an annual academic rate? Should it be like the federal rate, just the scholarship student-athletes or should we have a broader group of men?

The second one was what component should comprise the rate and how should they be combined? We take to this eligibility and retention and graduation of this, and we talked a little bit about their discussion on those issues.

The third one is essentially how do we define a rate that is appropriate that does what we want it to do? I would say at this point the committee came to the conclusion that we need more information and be able to actually satisfy these rates with different variations of possible rate and actions. So we will get to the idea of a pilot phase coming up in the very near future.

That is what No. 4 is all about. What data do we need to collect to evaluate these appropriately and understand how the different rates or possible rates might affect the membership, and who should participate in that setting?

The subcommittee that met came to some conclusions on some of these issues and also came to the conclusion that they needed some more information. In terms of the population, there was a pretty strong consensus on that group that it should be all student-athletes that received athletic aid at any time during their collegiate experience. That is somewhat different than the federal rate. As you know, the federal rate just asked for those student-athletes who entered as freshmen on athletic aid. If people get in after the first year, they were not included in that rate, and transfers in are not included in that rate. Their thinking is any student-athlete who would have received money at any time during their career would be included. With schools and programs that don't give aid and currently are exempt from the federal rate, they will go through the recruited student-athlete model.

All schools will be asked to participate and provide data on this academic progress rate, unlike some of the current standards. The components are going to be some combination of eligibility, retention and/or graduation. I think that fairly well sets it on those three.

Again, trying to keep it simple, they didn't want to go beyond those three manageable straightforward components. They were fairly clear that the waiting scheme, if you look at eligibility and retention and how they play out, those students who leave while academically ineligible should be weighted the most negatively as opposed to a student who leaves the institution that would have been academically eligible if they stayed. We are going to try to put together a system that assists students at high schools that are transferring and going to a pilot study. Let me talk a minute about that. We are going to all the institutions, every Division I institution, for some data. We are looking for six years worth of squad lists, for instance, on one or two sports from every institution. The sport groups we are going to look at are men's and women's basketball, men and women's track, cross country, and baseball. Each institution will be asked for one of those sports within those groups so then we would have comparative data on the federal graduation rate currently. For those particular sport groups, we want to see how these things correlate. We hope next to have 80 programs for each sport group. I would certainly ask all for your cooperation in helping to get this data. We think it is vital in making the rate that is effective for us and that is useful for the membership.

As for the nuts and bolts, we are trying to minimize the burden as much as we can on the institutions and trying to put as much of this data in from our end as we possibly can. We will be available for online submission. We hope that will help ease the burden a little bit. We have entered the squad list data from the squad lists that you have sent to us in the distribution formula. Most of the participants and most of the students we have questions about will be identified to your institution when you receive it online. We will be asking for year-by-year eligibility, retention and graduation information on all these students. Probably the one thing that is not currently on the squad list and that folks will have to go back and look at is that for those students who left your institution, would they have been eligible had they returned? How was the certification done on those folks? I think that would be the most burdensome part of this. I hope the forms will be online available February 1st. We will ask that you complete it by March 1st. We want to move this process forward as quickly as we can. We are asked to have a final analysis of this data by April 1 so that we can get this, as Kevin said, for the spring meetings and have some more specific information about this rate available for discussion by the spring and summer.

Mr. Lennon: I will turn it over to Todd Turner to talk about updates.

Todd Turner (Vanderbilt University): Thank you. Let me take this opportunity to thank Kevin and Diane. They have done a lot of the work in trying to provide the support and backing out the data that we need to give the proper context to the efforts we are involved in right now. The membership owes a great deal of credit to you folks who have done this work. Thank you very much.

The incentives/disincentives working group is an unusual title. That is what we are called. It is really going to respond to a Board of Directors that is very important to our presence—our CEOs. We would reward those teams that demonstrate commitment to progress and reward those who do and penalize those who do not. In my opinion, in listening to members of the Board who I have visited with, this is a serious opportunity for us to emphasize something that sets us apart in intercollegiate athletics from all others. This is a chance for us to emphasize our academic mission and to do it in context of competitiveness. That is the only challenge that you need.

It was clear to me also after meeting yesterday with the task force of the Board that they are very, very serious about reform. There is great interest also in the immediate imple-

mentation of whatever incentives and disincentives are developed versus some type of limitation litigation, which again will present an interesting challenge for the working group as we look to try to respond to that. It was clear to me that we want cultural change and we want it now. So using that as our charge, we have now moved forward working with the task force of the Board. We have a complex task at our feet, and the most difficult thing is going to be to make it simple and understandable. But we are going about doing that. There are 14 members of our working group from Division I-AA to all different areas of Division I-A. Today, we have two conference calls, and we will meet for the first time in person later this week in Indianapolis.

Some of the issues that we are considering in terms of incentives and disincentives relate to what we want to do. Probably one of our most difficult challenges will be to understand how to tie the annual academic progress rate to the incentives and disincentives. In one context, there is historical data that will have to be interpreted and evaluated over a period of time. On the other hand, there are immediate factors that could trigger incentives and disincentives that could be implemented more immediately. We will have to deal with that as well. We want to take that into consideration as we embark on this task of institutional differences. There are a wide variety of educational missions of our membership, and we certainly want to be responsive in understanding that.

We want to look at the idea of multiple-year implementation, that being if there are sanctions maybe there are degrees that occur over time as performance improves, or as academic performance decreases, there might be a series of penalties over time. Those are just some examples of some of the key issues we will be discussing. There are certainly others. Later this morning, I hope we might hear from you with ideas and other concepts that you would like the group to consider.

We have got a long list of possible incentives and disincentives that we will start to examine. Probably the most publicly visible and the one that has generated the most interest is access to postseason competition. You have probably seen some of that in recent news reports. We will look at revenue distribution, things like scholarship limits, things that might impact recruiting, such as official visits or minimum contacts that you might be able to make as a coach. There are a number of others. Some are dealing with things like access to television exposures, or additional financial penalties, such as reconfiguring the championship reimbursement rates for travel, limiting contests or practice opportunities, dealing with assigning some penalties that reduce the class time. I also think a very important incident that we can address is how to give public recognition and accolades to those that are doing an exceptional job with their students in the classroom.

So very quickly, that is just an overview of the activities of our incentives group. This is a forum and we are very interested in your questions and your feedback. I will turn this back over to Kevin and let him moderate that for us.

Mr. Lennon: Thank you, Todd. I am going to introduce one last panelist who has not been mentioned. That is Jim Castaneda, who is faculty athletics representative at Rice University, and chair of the Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Committee. Jim has looked at these issues for a number of years. We have provided a number of questions for you to consider to stimulate some discussion today. I would throw these out for your consideration as you think about the new standards, the new progress-toward-degree requirements, the new eligibility standards. Will this in any way have an impact on your recruiting procedures? Will this in any way impact the academic advising units on your campuses? What are the local implementation issues that you need to consider as we approach fall of 2003?

As Todd mentioned, the incentives and disincentives, we have seen a list of those that are being discussed. Which ones are most important to you? Are there others that you believe would be powerful in helping to change the culture? You have heard Todd talk about

the annual academic progress rate. What issues do we need to consider from your perspective that would make this a meaningful measurement of academic success in any issues you want to make sure are on the screen? The subcommittee is looking at those.

Those are just the start. I think at this point I will turn it over to you for any comments that you have. When you approach the microphone, if you would simply give your name and your institution that will be helpful.

Larry Bucher (University of Texas at Austin): I would like to comment on the annual progress rate. Something that is very important to this is the real timeliness of the rate. As you were saying earlier, there continues to be a real strong emphasis on graduation rate. Of course, that is a bottom line issue. I don't dispute that we need to look at graduation rate. But the problem with an accountability system that has incentives and disincentives tied to it, that rests on the graduation rate, there is not enough ownership of graduation rates.

There is a six-year lag between the student's entry and measurement of graduation rate. The average president in this country is not in place six years. Rapid turnover in coaches and athletic directors also is in that picture. What you end up with is that no one knows the graduation rates. So the progress rate, I think, has to rest to a greater degree on students being retained in good standing and making progress toward a degree. The real timeliness of this is there is a link between what you did last year and your academic programs and what your numbers say this year is very important especially if you are going to put an incentives and disincentives title to it.

Could someone here talk a little more about the shape of the thinking on the progress rate development and how much it is going to rest on the six-year kind of data to mature? How much of it will be closer to real life?

Mr. Lennon: Do any of the panelists want to take a shot at that before I start? I think the folks are sensitive to the issue that you talked about. That is why annual academic progress is being considered in tying in with incentives. We know the graduation rates are lacking. That is not one we can place immediate accountability on the coach or the institution.

What we don't know at this point is the waiting structure. That is one reason why the pilot study is being structured. We think that there are three components—eligibility, retention and then graduation. I would say graduation in that context is not necessarily the six-year graduation of the institution, rather it is how many students in that class were in the window of graduation. That becomes the component. The ongoing discussion now will be to what extent do you want to weight those particular variables? We think the pilot data will be instructive as we look at that. The meaningful numbers here are eligibility and retention. But eventually, they will graduate, particularly in the new progress standards. You may not need to wait for the graduation component in that particular equation, or the data could be compelling the other way. It could say we value that component more than retention and we would weight it in this formula in that way to reflect those particular values.

That is what we are looking for from the data. That is how the graduation component is being considered as it relates to the standard. I would distinguish it from the graduation rates in total, which, as you have noted, are problematic in a number of perspectives. Is that helpful?

Mr. Lawrence: These are the kinds of questions that we have wrestled with. Some of these difficult issues coming up in this graduation rate. I appreciate very much the context in which you put it.

Mr. Turner: That idea is not lost on me. I know exactly what you are talking about. I think one of the things we need to look at in our working group is how to tie immediate ownership to the immediate performance of those employees and students who are working for us. We will take a look at that.

Marilyn McNeil (Monmouth University): In some of the academic-progress rates, I know I am at an institution that doesn't give full athletic aid. I know there are a number of individuals, perhaps not in the majority, but when you take a snapshot of just those student-athletes who are on athletic aid, I am not sure that you get a good view of what our institutions are doing with all of our student-athletes.

I know you know that there are those on athletic aid and those institutions that do not give athletic aid and, therefore, would be all student-athletes. Has there been any thought about allowing the institution to choose its group of student-athletes? I know for our institution we would love to include all of our student-athletes. We recruited student-athletes, whether or not they are on athletic aid or not. I think that that would be a better picture of what we are doing than the other question.

Mr. Petr: On your campus, if there are entire programs that you don't offer any aid for, we would ask that you go to a recruited model for those programs as well. It moves it a little more in that direction. My recollection of the discussion of the subcommittee on this issue is that essentially that once you move to recruited models, it opens the population up dramatically. A lot of kids get recruited who may or may not actually do much in the way of participation in athletics. They had some struggle with that initial issue at that point and thought for simplicity and from a burden standpoint to use people who receive money and very straightforward calculations. I think they were trying to create a rate that was consistent and uniform across the institutions.

I am not saying there will be or won't be. I think that they might have a uniform standard for all institutions rather than allowing institutions to do something.

Mr. Castaneda: I would like to add whatever we did, we did hypothetically. One of the primary functions of a forum of this sort is to receive the input that you have provided about how this would affect different institutions.

In the incentives and disincentives part of the whole package, we legislated the academic reform package in a certain part of it, and that has already been in the past. Other parts to make it a so-called adherent package are still being worked on. I think that the input you have provided is certainly something that the consultants will very seriously consider before arriving at any ultimate decision.

Mr. Lennon: Any other comments from the gallery? Todd, one thing we have not touched on, because it has probably received much more favorable response and content at this point, is the NCAA graduation success rate. We talked about that and how the federal model may revise in a new rate. Will you briefly bring the group up to date on that?

Mr. Petr: There is another rate that is under consideration and moving forward through the process. We call it the graduation success rate. I don't know if that is what it will end up being called. I guess I would call it a complement to the federal graduation rate.

You know a lot of us feel that federal methodology has some fairly serious limitations. It certainly is a low-end account of the institution's real graduation rate. The proposed graduation success rate would include people who transferred into your institution who are not included in the federal calculation currently. It also would allow institutions to remove from the calculation those students who leave your institution, but only those who have been ineligible to compete in the next turnaround in which the term they left. So we believe it is perhaps more accurate and a fairer limitation of what success those individuals had at your institution while they were there. So that, as I say in reviewing it, is a certain complement to the federal rate. There has been some discussion with people in Washington and perhaps some movement will be made actually in the federal laws. We can't promise that at this point. But that has all been happening and going on.

Either way, I think Division I will be looked at as the opportunity to put this other graduation rate into effect pretty soon.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): Todd, with respect to the calculation of the rate that you were just discussing, would this be a student-athlete on the old rate, or anything else to try to generalize that concept to deny the undergraduate model?

Mr. Petr: At this point, we are reviewing it as just for student-athletes, but certainly anything that would alter the federal methodology would have to be an incentive in some sense, and in a fairly equitable sense to the student body as a whole. That is on the table. With the advent of the national student clearinghouse, the issues about transfer and eligibility and those kinds of things, this might be more equitable than they were 10 years ago from the general student-athlete body. I think that is all out there.

But right now, the way it is going to be is to take the graduation rate in the year of the transfer and use that in conjunction with the federal rate. The federal rate is the only one that would have a direct relationship with the student body.

Mr. Kingston: I think that there would be significant problems with the database that we now have, especially if you say we are going to take out of the calculation someone who would have been eligible had they remained in that term. For the non-athlete, undergraduate students to try to figure out if they were eligible, that will be different. We only have 50,000 at Arizona State.

Mr. Petr: That is complex.

Williams Perkins (Indiana University): Todd, at the same time as Division I is considering this graduation success rate, I am aware that Division II is looking at just a graduation rate that differs in some considerable ways from what Division I is proposing. Could you bring us up to date on where Division II is in terms of a pilot study that I know is ongoing? What kind of results is Division II getting? Would that impact what we might want to do in Division I?

Mr. Petr: Yes. Division II has conducted a fairly thorough pilot program on graduation rates. They don't have it currently on the table. It is something like graduation success rate. There are a couple of major differences as they stand right now between that and what has just been described here in Division I. The main one is that they are intense, and I think whatever legislation passes will include non-scholarship student-athletes in terms of a portion of the student-athletes who are on scholarship. It is much higher in Division II than it is in Division I right now. Also, they have been toying with the idea that if you are going to remove the successful transfer out and remove a person from the calculation at these institutions, you would actually have to confirm enrollment at another institution. Obviously, that is more burdensome. But they wanted to truly be able to say that this person was, in fact, transferring to another institution of higher education. The vast majority of students do, in fact, transfer and leave in good standing, and that may be an unnecessary step that you are using in the national clearinghouse to try to get transfers. We are going to look at that issue thoroughly in the second study. That would remove one of the other major differences if they decided they don't want that, because it changes things by 1 to 2 percent in the overall rate.

Mr. Lennon: Any other comments from the group? I might ask Todd Turner to address one point. He talked about the need for historical data that would be tied to incentives and disincentives. Perhaps you can tell us what you were thinking about in that regard.

Mr. Turner: There are a number of concepts that you could pursue. One would be to tie the number of initial grants-in-aid that you would offer to the success rate of your current scholarship athletes. You may not be able to equate that scholarship for a period of time. If you have other sanctions, maybe you reduce the number of contacts that your coaching staff can make or a limited number of initial visits permitted, so in some way you can have an immediate consequence of under-performance. If I could do this, I would do that with an incentive. But a disincentive is just an example.

Unidentified Delegate: The Association spends a tremendous amount of money on the certification process of Division I institutions. I am wondering how the work of this committee will affect the certification of the institutions who might wind up on one of your lists as either incentives or disincentives?

I can't possibly imagine someone who had some type of violations or didn't meet some type of standing could be certified, particularly in the academic integrity area. Has the committee thought about this?

Mr. Lennon: I know that some committees have. If the group is not aware, there is an ongoing review right now of the athletics certification program, consisting of members of the Committee on Athletics Certification, as well as Management Council representatives. Just a couple of weeks ago this exact issue was raised. As you consider the scope and the effectiveness of the athletics certification program, is it doing what it is intended to do? One of the primary focuses here is to ensure athletic integrity and progress of our student-athletes. We have to ask the question, is it doing that as well as it could do it? How do these new standards impact the review as a part of the athletics certification program? So it is absolutely on their screen. One issue that I know that the academic consultants have thought about and considered that perhaps needs to be a component, is the degree selection of our student-athlete issues. Do we see trends on the campus of channeling students into specific degree programs? Does our current athletics certification program address that adequately? There has been that type of discussion. I can assure you that as the athletics certification review goes on doing what it is intended to do, are there other means that have been as effective in the program? The academic reform component will be in that program and will be a part of its review and discussion. I can assure you that is going to take place. I hope that answers your question.

Do we have any other thoughts or comments from the group here? Hearing none, thank you for your time.

Mr. Bates: One final reminder. The Management Council and the Board of Directors have our luncheon starting at 12:15 in Ballroom H. Thank you. We are adjourned.

[The Forum was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.]

Division II Business Session

Monday, January 13, 2003

The Division II Forum was called to order at 8:11 a.m., with Presidents Council Chair Patricia Cormier, Longwood College, presiding.

Opening Remarks

Ms. Cormier: Good morning. The 2003 Division II business session will come to order. I'm Patricia Cormier, president of Longwood University and chair of the Division II Presidents Council.

I know that all of us are very cheerful about being in Anaheim. I wanted to do something this morning to sort of get us into the spirit of Minnie and Mickey. So recently I went out on a little shopping spree, and I bought something for the "Father of the Century." At this time, I would like to afford Mike Racy a little token of our appreciation for everything that he does for us. Mike (presenting "Winnie the Pooh" hat), and Jan Brown.

If they are very good, they get to keep that. We knew you'd like that, Mike. Mike was wondering why I was delaying, waiting to open the Convention. That was the reason why. I couldn't afford to miss this. That's for the kids, not for you.

I would like the other Division II Management Council and Presidents Council officers to stand and be recognized at this time: Presidents Council Vice-Chair, Frank Brown, Columbus State University; Management Council Chair, Mike Marcil, commissioner, North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Management Council Vice-Chair, Joan McDermott, athletics director, Metropolitan State College of Denver. Please applaud these individuals for the work they do. (Applause.)

I would like to introduce the other individuals who are on the dais. Please welcome Larry Fitzgerald, faculty athletics representative, Southern Connecticut State University, who will serve our as Division II parliamentarian. (Applause.)

You've just met Minnie and Mickey—Mickey being Mike Racy, who's our chief of staff for Division II, and Minnie being Jan Brown, assistant chief of staff for Division II. Please applaud these individuals because they work very hard on our behalf. (Applause.)

I would also like to introduce our legislative experts with us today. Missy McCracken and Terri Steeb of the NCAA membership services staff will be available to answer legislative questions that may come up during the day.

Finally, let me introduce other NCAA staff members who are with us this morning. They should please stand as I call their names: Dave Pickle, The NCAA News; Ruth Reinhardt, executive assistant for Division II; Ann Weber, who is also working with Division II; Sharon Cessna and Troy Arthur, liaisons to the NCAA Division II Championships Committee; Joyce Collins, liaison to the Division II Budget and Finance Committee; Rich McGlynn, Paul Parker and Bill Regan, liaisons to the Division II Membership Committee; and Jill Waddell, membership services staff. Thank you again for all that you do. (Applause.)

Kate Willett, our Division II governance intern, is assisting with the Division II student-athlete video images that you see on the screen.

We will have a little interruption in our business session. Myles Brand will be joining this session at approximately 9 a.m. We will interrupt our business at that time to welcome him. I don't think he's going to spend a lot of time with us. He wanted to express to you his interest in the division that is second to none.

Let me call your attention to some general announcements. Before we begin the voting process this morning, we need to review how to use the voting units. As you know, this is something that doesn't always work quite the way we want it to. First, let me remind you how to cast a vote using the voting units.

[Note: Voting procedures were explained to the delegates.]

Roberts Rules of Order provides the procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such legislative requirements and procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of the Official Notice. In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendixes in the blue pages that list procedural information that may be of assistance to you.

NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take time to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to ensure fairness, but I will remind the delegates that we fully intend to apply these procedures throughout the business of the Convention.

There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently. Let me briefly review those. We will use the voting machines for roll-call votes. All other votes will be by paddles. I will attempt to eyeball as many votes as possible, calling for a machine count only when there is doubt as to whether there is a majority. Although the delegates have a right to ask for it, I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a machine vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue. If a delegate intends to debate an issue during the business session, we ask that you be at one of the microphone locations, and be prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks.

The microphone numbers will be used to recognize speakers. Delegates will be limited to speak to no single motion more than twice. If I see no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible. The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA conventions are set forth in NCAA legislation and are summarized in the introduction to the Official Notice. I will not repeat them here.

Identify yourself by name and affiliation whenever you address the Convention. Delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate, other than as observers.

Let me also review briefly the window of reconsideration opportunity. After we complete the Presidents Council grouping, we will take a very short break in our proceedings to allow delegates to caucus about the possibility of reconsideration. After the break, I will call for a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that have been voted on so far—Proposal Nos. 7 through 29. All motions to reconsider Proposal Nos. 7 through 29 must occur during this window of reconsideration for the proposals in the Presidents Council grouping. Please note that some proposals have immediate effective dates for implementation. For such proposals, the immediate effective date must be considered first, followed by a vote on the merits of the proposal. If an immediate effective date is defeated and the proposal is adopted, the effective date will be August 1, 2003.

We have a court reporter to prepare a transcript of this business session, so I remind you again to identify yourself and your institution or affiliation whenever you speak.

Let me also call to your attention, two Convention publications. First, the Convention Program that you received at registration. Beginning on Page 13, you will find the program for today's Division II business session. The second publication is the 2003 NCAA Convention Official Notice, which you should have received in November. In Appendix A you will find a list of the 38 legislative proposals, two amendments-to-amendments and one resolution that will be considered during the business session.

I would also like to call your attention to the procedural issues memo that was handed out this morning. Attached to this memo you will find a copy of amendment-to-amendment 36-1 that the Presidents Council agreed to sponsor yesterday morning.

We will attempt to follow the business session schedule as it is listed on Pages 13 and 14 of the Convention Program. We will recess around 11:30 a.m. for lunch, and we will try to conclude our business and adjourn the session by mid-afternoon if not before. Please return from lunch by 1 p.m., ready to continue the afternoon session.

Please note that on Page 4 of the Convention Program there are minor corrections to some of the Division II proposals. These are technical revisions that do not alter the original intent of the sponsors. Also refer to the procedural issues handout you received that includes clarifications and corrections that did not make it into the program.

One action that we must dispense with first is approving the Convention Notice and Convention Program before beginning our business. If we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order in which they appear in those publications. If you wish to move to reorder a proposal, now is the time to do so.

I also want to point out that by adopting the Official Notice, you are adopting the incorporation of interpretations described in Appendix C, Pages 97 to 98; the noncontroversial amendments in Appendix E, Pages 103 to 134; and the intent-based amendments in Appendix G, Pages 153 to 156. These interpretations and amendments all have been approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council during the past 12 months. We will not discuss any of them individually, unless you move to do so.

I will now ask for a motion to adopt the Official Notice and the printed program of this Convention so that we may proceed with our work.

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): On behalf of the Management Council, I move to adopt the Official Notice and Program with reordering so that Proposals No. 36 and 36-1 are considered after Proposal No. 28, but prior to Proposal No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

Recently, a number of coaches and administrators expressed concerns about the football practice start-date legislation set forth in Convention Proposal No. 29. These concerns include the number of practice opportunities available, the potential for other health and safety issues, and the potential for inconsistent start dates for all fall sports. All of these concerns can be eliminated if the reordering of proposals is supported.

Many coaches and administrators support the health and safety changes set forth in Proposal No. 29, but prefer the first practice date concept as set forth in Proposal 36-1, that is 21 days prior to the first permissible date of competition.

The current order of these proposals, as set forth in the Official Notice, will render Proposal No. 36, Part C, moot if Proposal No. 29 is adopted. That would mean that the membership would not be permitted to adopt both of these proposals.

If the reordering is supported and we consider Proposal Nos. 36 and 36-1 prior to considering Proposal No. 29, then it would at a minimum provide a way in which the membership can adopt both proposals if it so wishes. In light of these concerns that have been brought to the Management Council, we would like to see Proposals 36 and 36-1 reordered to appear for consideration after Proposal No. 28. We urge the membership to support this motion.

[The motion to re-order the proposals was approved.]

Reports

Ms. Cormier: This year we once again decided to take a different approach regarding Convention reports, including the annual reports delivered by the Presidents Council, the Management Council and the Budget and Finance Committee. In an effort to be more efficient with our time and to keep our voting delegates awake, we decided to produce a written version of the reports you traditionally have listened to in the morning business session.

Each of you should have received a copy of the Division II 2002 Yearbook. There are many copies, so you must take some home. I hope you find this written summary informative and interesting.

I will now turn the microphone over to President Frank Brown to deliver a few brief remarks about the Division II Yearbook. Before Frank speaks, I would also like to take a moment to recognize a special Presidents Council member for his years of service and for his contributions to Division II. This individual will complete his four-year term of office on the Presidents Council following this year's Convention.

Bernard Franklin has served as vice-chair of the Presidents Council the past two years. You will recognize him from his tireless efforts on numerous Division II committees and project teams. I personally have enjoyed my time with Bernard very, very much. Bernard, would you please stand and accept our applause. (Applause.)

Frank, if you will come to the podium.

Frank Brown (Columbus State University): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Last year, as President Cormier has indicated to you, we provided to each delegate to the Division II Convention, a yearbook that contained committee reports and important facts related to our division. That yearbook helped us to conduct our business session more efficiently, and it provided you with written reports to take back to your campuses.

The yearbook, by all accounts, was a huge success. So we decided to produce the yearbook on an annual basis. As President Cormier indicated to you, this book should have been in your registration packet when you arrived. If you missed it, there are copies at each watering station in the hall here today. Please take one when you depart. You may also find the contents of the yearbook on the NCAA Division II Web site.

If you'll permit me now to take a couple of minutes to highlight some information that is included in the yearbook.

In the membership profile section, you'll find an updated version of Division II facts and figures. This document provides a snapshot and profile of Division II membership. For an in-depth review of Division II, I encourage you to read the Division II membership profile booklet passed out earlier.

The Division II news makers section highlights some of the accomplishments of Division II student-athletes and administrators. We should all be very proud of our division and proud to have these individuals as part of our larger NCAA panel.

One individual to whom I would like to call your attention is Tanisha Silas. In November, Tanisha was given the highest award to an NCAA female student-athlete, the NCAA Woman of the Year Award. If you'll turn your attention now to the video screen, you will see the video that introduced Tanisha at the 2002 NCAA Woman of the Year dinner in Indianapolis.

[Note: The delegates viewed the videotape.]

There are many stories like Tanisha Silas in Division II. We're proud and excited about her recognition as NCAA Woman of the Year.

The Division II strategic plan 2002 accomplishments, also in the yearbook, are summarized as strategic achievements in Division II for this past year. As a result of our strategic

plan, the division has expanded championship brackets, enhanced conference office operations, assisted student-athletes in achieving academic success, simplified the Division II Manual and strengthened the division's membership requirements.

You may recall that the goals and priorities identified in the plan were developed in 1999. This year, the Management Council and Presidents Council will update the goals and priorities outlined in the plan and present the updated strategic plan to the membership.

A couple more points about the yearbook. The next sections relate to the committee reports of the Division II governance structure. These reports deliver important information regarding the initiatives undertaken by each committee. I encourage you to read the committee reports and to contact the committee chair and staff liaison identified if you have questions or concerns.

The next two sections in the yearbook are the strategic plan priorities and the Division II budget for 2002 through 2004.

Priorities in the upcoming year include implementing student-athlete academic support and health and safety grants, enhancing student-athlete involvement in the Division II governance process, developing the guidelines and criteria for the Division II student-athlete assistance fund, championship bracket expansion, and planning a summit to study the issue of women and minority opportunities in coaching in Division II.

The long-range budget plan provides a forecast of projected revenue and expenses for the next six years. The Budget and Finance Committee will use these projections as it evaluates funding new strategic initiative requests.

In the yearbook you also will find information concerning how conferences have used their money under the conference grant program and the result of a survey concerning the role of Division II senior woman administrators.

I hope this yearbook will be useful to all of us. Time has been set aside at the conclusion of our legislative business today for questions and comments you might have about the yearbook or about anything in the work of Division II and its governance structure.

President Cormier, this concludes my report.

Ms. Cormier: Thank you very much, Frank. (Applause.)

It's also been my pleasure to work with Frank Brown over the last several months. I can tell you that he's doing an outstanding job. You trained him well, Bernard. We know that.

Before I introduce our new president—he has just joined us at the Convention—I would like to ask two schools to come forward. We're going to try to fix your voting machines. The Great Northwest Athletic Conference and the University of California, San Diego, if you could come forward, we'll see if we can fix those machines for you.

It is now both an honor and a privilege to introduce the new president of the NCAA, Dr. Myles Brand. As I told you earlier this morning, he's going to spend a few minutes with us to acknowledge the importance of Division II to the NCAA. (Applause.)

NCAA President Myles Brand: Thank you. It's a privilege to be here.

I am in a learning mode. One of the things I'm learning more and more each day is the strength and vision of Division II.

A number of the initiatives that have been passed by this body are of a landmark nature, and in my view, should be emulated by the other divisions. Your ability, for example, to integrate intercollegiate athletics into the overall academic mission of the institution, and the specific concrete steps that you've taken over time, budgetarily and academically, are noteworthy.

It's a division that consists of the strength of the heart of America's institutions of higher education, and I understand better and better every day why you take such great pride in this division.

I spent yesterday evening talking to most of you about my views of the future of the NCAA. I don't see any reason to repeat that. You have a lot of good work to do.

I do want to invite any comments or questions you might have. I'll do my best to answer them. So please feel free to join the conversation and raise the issues that you might want to raise.

I see I have convinced you of everything I've had to say.

I look forward to working with the leadership, but most especially, with all the membership of this fine and important division of our organization. Thank you. (Applause.)

CONSENT PACKAGE

Proposed Amendments

Ms. Cormier: Thank you very much, Myles Brand. We are so pleased he was able to join us for a few moments.

We're now ready to begin our voting process. We're going to begin with Proposal Nos. 1 through 6. They are part of the consent package that is intended to be voted on as a group.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposal Nos. 7 through 29 as those that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers, and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping this year. After considering the Presidents Council grouping, we will then consider the rest of the legislation, beginning with Proposal No. 30. Proposal Nos. 30 to 39 will be considered by paddle vote.

We will now begin our consideration of legislative proposals. We will start on Page 2 of the Official Notice with the consent package.

As we begin, I would like to remind you to please state your name and institution for the record when you are recognized by the chair at one of the numbered microphones.

Proposal Nos. 1 through 6 make up the consent package and will be considered as a group unless there is an objection. These are proposals that the Management Council and Presidents Council have determined to be housekeeping in nature. Proposal No. 4 has an immediate effective date; however, it is included in the consent package that is intended to be voted on as a group. A separate vote on the immediate effective date for this proposal will only be necessary if a motion is made to withdraw it from the consent package and consider it separately.

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): On behalf of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and Management Council, I move Proposals Nos. 1 through 6 as the consent package.

[The motion was seconded.]

Each of these proposals was placed in the consent package because of the nature of the change being proposed. Each of these six proposals is either procedural, without controversy or editorial in nature. Therefore it is appropriate to vote on all six as a package. We urge the membership to do so.

[The NCAA Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supported the consent package.]

[The consent package was approved.]

SENIOR WOMAN ADMINISTRATOR – DUTIES

Peggy Green (Fayetteville State University): On behalf of the project team to review issues related to diversity, I would like to move Proposal No. 7.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was created for the specific purpose of ensuring the enhancement and active involvement of female administrators within athletics departments. This proposal is

permissive in nature. It is not simply a definition of the senior woman administrator. It is a portrait of her program-wide tasks and responsibilities as an integral part of the athletics management team. As such, she is the highest ranking female on staff, affording her the opportunity to utilize her talents and abilities in the overall management and organization of the athletics department. Along with such status and valued role comes respect and presence. Thus, the institutions' intercollegiate athletics mission and program development is significantly enhanced with the inclusion of the senior woman administrator as a vital part of the athletics department.

I strongly urge the support of this substantive proposal. Please join me in support of Proposal No. 7.

Michael Kovalchik (Hillsdale College): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 7.

The senior woman administrator title was originally established 20 years ago as a way to involve an athletics administrator who is female in the decision-making process for the institution's overall intercollegiate athletics program. Since that time, college athletics has changed significantly. Even more significant is the change at the Division II level. Currently, the number of Division II student-athletes participating has grown by 50 percent.

Even with the increased number of student-athletes participating in intercollegiate sports and the increased demands in the athletics department, the number of woman administrators has fallen, and the responsibilities of many senior woman administrators has diminished.

Personally, I include my SWA in meetings with senior staff, in hiring, athletics budget decisions and athletics personnel issues. She serves as an active athletics director when I am not available.

Having an SWA involved in the operations of the overall athletics program has allowed me to be more engaged in activities on campus, in the conference and at the national level, as well as in critical fund-raising needs.

This permissive legislation also will allow more opportunity to engage women administrators in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics programs when the athletics director is a female. This would directly benefit the division because there would be more women eligible to serve in the division's governance structure.

Please join me in support of Proposal No. 7.

George Meese (Eckerd College): I'm in full support of the intent of this legislation, but I do want to make some objection to the language. If it is a permissive piece of legislation, the language should be consistent with permissive tone.

Shared governance council or a committee that sets athletics policy at a college, can be just as effective as an executive staff of two or three top persons, especially if that group's work is open to all and includes student-athletes and advises the administrator, who is senior to the athletics director.

If the SWA is one of those persons, the NCAA should be supportive and encouraging of such other alternative structures of governance. I see this language as too restrictive and close to micromanaging our colleges' administrative structure. Therefore, the use of "must" in the second sentence, and the stipulation of professional athletics as the qualification for that administrator in the final sentence, are objectionable.

I believe we can achieve much better progress by being open to innovative arrangements that honor women and men, and place the senior woman administrator in effective positions that vary from school to school. Thank you.

Nancy Belck (University of Nebraska at Omaha): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 7.

This proposal better defines and clarifies the expectation of the Division II senior woman

administrator. The current definition is unclear. As a result, 55 percent of Division II institutions have designated as the SWA a secretary or full-time coach with no administrative responsibilities. That's 55 percent.

The new legislation clarifies that the SWA should be a key voice in the administration of governance of an institution's athletics program. She should be involved in the conduct of the overall athletics program and should have substantive administrative duties.

Proposal No. 7 will also allow a female athletics director to designate another female as the SWA. This change should enhance opportunities to involve female associate and assistant athletics directors in conference and national issues.

I urge your support for this legislative proposal that further defines the role of the senior woman administrator. The passage of this proposal will show Division II's commitment to enhancing this role and that we believe women athletics administrators play an important role in our athletics departments and on our campuses. Thank you.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 7 was adopted, 224-11-2.]

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL – BUDGETARY CONTROL – FINANCIAL AUDIT

Thomas Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I would like to move Proposal 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this endeavor is to allow member institutions, if they do their institutional budget at least every three years, to include the athletics department as part of the audit.

Michael Covone (Barry University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 8.

Many institutions already require audits of athletics department expenditures. This proposal exception would reduce expenses and reduce the administrative burden for Division II institutions, while maintaining that all athletics departments are subject to a financial audit at least once every three years.

For the stated reasons, please vote in support of Proposal No. 8.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 8 was adopted.]

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL – SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION – COMPLIANCE REVIEW

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I move Proposal No. 9.

It is the position of my conference, as well as a number of others, that compliance is not voluntary. A check of the number of secondary violations reported to the NCAA in 2001 shows less than one per member institution. Surely, no one believes that institutions in this room did not incur any secondary violations.

This legislation would require a compliance review to be done once every 10 years. It seems reasonable that this would be done in connection with an ISSG, which is required once every five years.

Our conference has scheduled our reviews to be in sequence with the ISSG. It's worked very well and required little if any additional planning and preparation. This review would not have to be done by the NCAA staff. A conference office could conduct such a review or it could be conducted by an outside consultant, which would have to be approved by the conference office.

It concerns me that there are institutions competing year in and year out in NCAA cham-

pionships, as well as possibly winning NCAA titles, that have not or may never have a compliance review, either by their conference or the NCAA.

Certification of eligibility in postseason competition rests with the participating institutions. No longer are teams required to turn in eligibility lists confirming that the student-athletes are eligible.

Every one of my members that has had a membership compliance review on its campus has been more than pleased with the results. Many times, significant progress has been made with more effective communication between athletics and financial aid or admissions.

Should this put stress on the present membership staff, I'm an advocate of designated funding via the conference grant program for this to occur.

What is more important than compliance? We believe that once every 10 years would create a level playing field for all members and provide some assurances that all rules and regulations are being followed. While I understand there will be some opposition expressed to this proposal, I think I would point out a couple of things that may be stressed at that time.

I believe the opposition will say this is similar to the Division I certification process. That's not right. That's comparing apples and oranges. The Division I certification process involves a multitude of areas, not just compliance. They look at Title IX, they look at academics, they look at financial audits, they look at the mission statements. It's far more than just a compliance review, which is all we're proposing.

The other issue may be the financial implications. Inasmuch as we have recently found a million dollars to expand our football championships and other sports, I believe that we can find some money to make this system work.

I urge your support of this legislation.

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 9.

The Membership Committee opposes this proposal. By permitting the NCAA, a conference office or any authority outside of the athletics department approved by the conference office to do the review, the proposal does not guarantee consistency in review process.

Secondly, the Membership Committee believes that institutions should have the option in reviewing their athletics department's compliance procedures when it deems appropriate.

Thirdly, this proposal would have a huge impact on the Division II budget. It would require additional staffing to manage 30 to 40 reviews per year. The additional funding has not been provided for in the Division II budget.

For all of these reasons, the Management Council strongly opposes this proposal. Please join us in opposition.

Steve Murray (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): While I appreciate there will be concerns about this proposal, let me add my points about the motivation for proposing such legislation.

This is not an attempt at certification. The ISSG is a similar program. It would be in conjunction with those programs, once every 10 years. It's not an attempt to make a terribly intrusive act on the institutions. It's something that certainly is important for compliance.

As Ralph stated earlier, we all received a list of secondary infractions compiled during the 2001 academic year by all the institutions in this room. There was concern by the Management Council and the Presidents Council about those numbers, not the overabundance of those numbers, but actually the lack of those numbers, which indicates probable weaknesses in compliance systems in this division.

While I appreciate there will be a great deal of opposition to this legislation, the Presidents Council and the Management Council do receive the message from the member-

ship that compliance be brought back onto the table and the front burner of Division II in the future, through either the grant program or some other program. Thank you.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 9 was defeated.]

AMATEURISM – DEFINITION OF PROFESSIONAL TEAM

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): On behalf of the Amateurism Project Team and Council, I move Proposal No. 10.

[The motion was seconded.]

Although at the 2001 Convention, Division II deregulated competition on professional teams prior to initial collegiate enrollment, enrolled student-athletes are still prohibited from competing on professional teams. The current definition of a professional team, however, does not clearly define what makes a team professional.

In addition, the current legislation prohibits enrolled student-athletes from participating on teams that are funded by professional sports organizations, even if these teams are clearly amateur in all other respects and no member of the team receives any financial remuneration.

This proposal will specify what makes a team professional and will allow enrolled student-athletes to participate on teams that are clearly amateur in nature. It is therefore in both the spirit of deregulation and student-athlete welfare.

In addition, the same legislation is being considered in both Division I and Division III, as well as in Division II. Adopting this proposal will result in a consistent definition of a professional team across all three divisions.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 10 was adopted.]

AMATEURISM – EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES – PROFESSIONAL TEAM/LEAGUE

Mary Gardner (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to move Proposal No. 11.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would enable a student-athlete to receive educational expenses from a professional team, provided the following stipulations are met: The student-athlete is no longer involved in professional athletics; the student-athlete is not receiving any remuneration from the professional sports organization; the student-athlete does not have an active contractual agreement with any professional team; the disbursement of the aid is through the member institution, ensuring the value of the aid alone or in combination with other aid does not exceed the value of a full grant-in-aid; and finally, the receipt of the aid makes a student-athlete a counter and the aid must be counted in maximum-award limitations.

As you're aware, the Amateurism Project Team has spent the last four years reviewing the issue of Division II amateurism rules, and at the 2000 Convention, we, as a division, adopted positive changes to the Division II amateurism rules. Following the adoption of the changes, the project team learned of situations where a failed professional who wishes to attend a college could have his or her educational expenses paid for by a professional team.

The project team believes that the aforementioned conditions provide the necessary safety net to allow that to happen in an acceptable manner.

In the spirit of deregulation and on behalf of student-athlete welfare, I encourage you to support this proposal.

[SAAC Position: Support.]
[Proposal No. 11 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY – FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT

Ross Brummett (Carson-Newman College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee I would like to move Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal fulfills the membership's desire to both deregulate the Manual and to simplify it. It combines the legislation currently in 14.6.1 and 14.6.2 into one single bylaw. It reduces duplication, lessens confusion and removes a page or so from the Manual. It is worthy of our strongest support.

On behalf of Legislation Committee, I move the approval of Proposal 12.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 12 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY – PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZED COMPETITION – ACADEMIC YEAR IN RESIDENCE

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to move Proposal 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal relates to the academic year in residence requirement of the seasons of competition rule, which was the cornerstone of the amateurism deregulation at the 2001 Convention.

Initially, the Amateurism Project Team thought it best to require the student-athlete who had triggered the season of competition rule due to participation in organized competition to fulfill that academic year in residence at a certifying Division II institution.

The project team later recommended an official interpretation that was dated July 24, 2001, to specify that the requirement could be fulfilled at any Division II institution. Subsequent to that interpretation, as most of you know, Division I and Division III amended their amateurism legislation to more closely reflect Division II.

In addition, the project team re-examined the original intent of the residency requirement, which was to ensure that a student-athlete who initially chose to forego college enrollment to participate in competition, was academically prepared and committed to college upon eventual matriculation.

In light of the Division I and Division III legislation amendments, there is no need for the student to now fulfill that in a Division II institution. Thus, as long as the student-athlete enrolls at an NCAA member institution, the original intent will be satisfied.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 13 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY – HARDSHIP WAIVER – FIRST HALF OF PLAYING SEASON

Suzanne Sanreget (Michigan Technological University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 14 is intended to create a simpler and more fair way in which a student-athlete qualifies for a hardship waiver. Presently, the student-athlete must incur his or her

season-ending injury during the first half of the playing season in order to receive a hardship waiver.

If adopted, this proposal would remove that requirement, while maintaining that all other current legislative requirements be met. If adopted, student-athletes who would not have otherwise been eligible for a medical hardship because he or she sustained a season-ending injury late in the season, would still be eligible, as long as he or she has not participated in more than two contests or 20 percent of the scheduled contests.

The simplicity is in the spirit of deregulation and does not jeopardize the intent of the original legislation.

I strongly urge your support for this proposal.

Quinn Baker (Great Northwest Athletic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal 14. This legislation supports student-athlete welfare initiatives, and we feel it is important to look at the number of contests or dates of competition, rather than when these competitions take place.

This legislation would permit student-athletes who sat out the first part of the season due to their position on the depth chart and entered a game in the second half of the regular season and were injured, to get that year back.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 14 was adopted, 218-19-1.]

ELIGIBILITY – SEASON OF COMPETITION – WAIVER

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): On behalf of the Administrative Review Subcommittee, the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, and Management Council, I move Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Administrative Review Committee and the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee both support this proposal to expand the current season of competition waiver to include eligible student-athletes.

Currently, if a student-athlete competes in limited competition and is unable to complete the remainder of the year due to extraordinary circumstances, an institution would be required to file a minimum amount of competition waiver with the Administrative Review Subcommittee.

Based on the increasing number of waiver requests regarding the use of a season, the Administrative Review Subcommittee has determined that the waiver criteria should be incorporated into the bylaws and that authority for administering the waiver should rest with the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, which administers all other such waivers.

Under the proposal, a student-athlete would be eligible for a waiver if he or she withdraws from school as a result of a life-threatening illness or injury suffered by a member of the student-athlete's immediate family, withdraws from school as a result of extreme financial difficulties experienced by the student-athlete or an individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent, or the student-athlete's institution dropped the sport during the season after the student-athlete had competed.

We also wish to point out that if a student-athlete received such a waiver, the student-athlete would be withheld on a one-for-one basis for the contests in which the student-athlete had competed.

We urge support for this proposal.

[SAAC Position: Support.]
[Proposal No. 15 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY – FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS – CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS

Kevin Hickey (Assumption College): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think that this is one of the most easily understood changes that we propose today. It simply increases from 13 to 14 the number of core courses a student must complete to establish initial eligibility and requires that one additional core-course unit be earned in any core-course area. This is not hard to understand, but it may be difficult to know whether it's a good thing without first knowing the research that led to this proposal.

As a member of the Academic Requirements Committee, I was able to examine firsthand Division II-specific research relating to the benefits of increasing the minimum number of core courses from 13 to 14. This research tells me that this is a good change. I'm here to explain to you what that research says, so that you may more confidently join me in support of this proposal.

The research indicates the average number of core course units currently completed by a Division II student-athlete who is declared eligible is 17.63. This is 3.63 units above the proposed minimum. The research also demonstrated that student-athletes who successfully complete a 14th core course had higher standardized test scores, which benefit prospective student-athletes and equates to more academic success in their first year of college enrollment.

The research also indicates that a small number of prospective student-athletes would be declared ineligible because they would not be able to meet this new standard if it were applied today. However, the delayed effective date will help to limit this impact.

Finally, the research also indicates that this change will have a far less disparate impact on minorities than would an increase in grade-point average or an increase in test-score requirements.

This is a step in the right direction with limited consequences and many benefits. For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 16.

Bernard Franklin (Virginia Union University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 16.

In Proposal No. 16, we have the opportunity to enhance the academic preparedness of our student-athletes prior to enrollment in a Division II institution. The membership agreed at the 1992 Convention that the move from 11 core courses to 13 core courses was a positive step forward in assuring that our student-athletes are academically prepared for college.

It should be noted that student-athletes in particular sports and subgroups in the 1995 cohort, which was the first class subject to 13 core courses, graduated with grades higher than the 1994 cohort. Although it is impossible to say whether the increase in core courses has a causal relationship with the increase in graduation rates, the two increases did happen concurrently.

I think we all can agree that the record is fairly clear that the increase from 11 to 13 was very helpful in preparing our student-athletes for college. Therefore, to continue to ensure our student-athletes are academically prepared, I urge your support for Proposal No. 16.

Ben Giess (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 16 because it focuses on the preparation of high-school student-athletes. By raising the standard, the student-athlete will have a greater opportunity for academic success. Further, the proposal exemplifies the NCAA's continuing emphasis on academics.

We encourage you to support this legislation. Thank you.

Kay Schallenkamp (Emporia State University): I support Proposal 16. I'm pleased that we are in agreement with the SAAC.

I agree, we do have an opportunity before us to continue to enhance the academic preparedness of our student-athletes and to ensure that they are not only successful athletically, but also academically at our colleges and universities.

The research has demonstrated that the increase in academic requirements makes sense by better preparing our student-athletes for their first year of college—the most at-risk year. The benefits of this proposal will exceed the liabilities and will have a far less disparate impact on our academically at-risk student-athletes than would an increase in the grade-point average or test-score requirements.

This proposal demonstrates that Division II has academic expectations of our student-athletes. For this reason, I urge your support.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 16 was adopted, 222-14-1.]

ELIGIBILITY – DETERMINATION OF FRESHMAN AND TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY – PARTICIPATION BEFORE CERTIFICATION

Duane Hopkins (Florida Southern College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee I would like to move Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

The current bylaws establish different periods of temporary participation prior to certification for recruited prospects and nonrecruited prospects—two weeks for recruited, and 45 days for nonrecruited.

Current bylaws do not specify what type of days or weeks must be included, nor whether the reference is to calendar days or weeks or to practice days or weeks. There appears to be no compelling reason why different periods, measured or described in different ways, should apply to recruited and nonrecruited student-athletes in this situation.

Proposal No. 17, if adopted, would create consistency in the treatment of recruited and nonrecruited student-athletes with respect to temporary certification.

Additionally, the legislation would not affect any of the financial aid provisions related in temporary certification, in that the bylaw would still govern financial aid.

The adoption of this legislation clearly supports the deregulation objective, while making the bylaws more consistent and easier for the membership to interpret and apply.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 17 was adopted, 223-15-1.]

SATISFACTORY PROGRESS REQUIREMENT – HOURS EARNED OR ACCEPTED FOR DEGREE CREDIT

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

When a student-athlete has designated a degree program in his or her first two years, the current legislation requires an institution to count only those courses that apply for the

designated degree. As a result, which the Legislation Committee believes was unintended, student-athletes are discouraged from taking courses outside their designated degree program during the first two years.

In some cases, student-athletes have actually been discouraged from declaring a major early on. They fear that they may be disadvantaged if they want to legitimately enroll in an elective course outside their declared major in order to explore whether their interest in a secondary area is genuine.

This proposal, if adopted, will permit student-athletes to take courses outside their degree program during the first two years of enrollment, even if they have designated a specific degree program. The institution may use the courses for satisfactory progress, provided the courses are acceptable in any degree program. After the second year, all courses used for satisfactory progress must be acceptable in the designated degree program.

As you know, courses taken during the first two years of enrollment are often general education courses that are accepted by any degree program and are typically required for graduation. Student-athletes who have already designated a degree should also be afforded the same opportunity as the general student population to explore alternative degree programs and courses, without jeopardizing progress toward their currently designated degree.

For all these reasons, and in the spirit of deregulation, I urge your support of Proposal 18.

Brianna Williams (Carolinas-Virginia Athletic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 18. Previous legislation may encourage student-athletes to make a hurried decision about their degree program, which may contribute to academic dissatisfaction. This proposal will help prevent unnecessary urgency and pressure from faculty and athletics administrators who advise student-athletes about their degree programs.

Further, the Division II SAAC feels this proposal highlights student-athlete welfare as their main priority. We encourage you to support this piece of legislation.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 18 was adopted, 232-2-0.]

SATISFACTORY PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS – FULFILLMENT OF MINIMUM GRADE-POINT-AVERAGE REQUIREMENTS

Paul Engelmann (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 19 changes the requirement for minimum GPA from one based on seasons of competition to one based on academic hours earned.

The current requirement is essentially the only eligibility rule we have based on seasons of competition. Everything else is determined by completed credit hours. This will make the current rule consistent with our satisfactory-progress rules.

The proposal simplifies legislation in that it eliminates the confusion concerning hardship years, redshirt years and multisport participants. Additionally, the rule strengthens our academic requirements by eliminating the current loophole that nonparticipants, including nonqualifiers, have no GPA requirement for their first season of competition if they meet the residency requirement.

With this legislation, student-athletes must maintain an acceptable grade-point average, regardless of whether they compete and use a season of competition. Please note that a modification based on intent has been issued by the Management Council and Presidents

Council to clarify that this will not require midyear certification if a student-athlete goes over the next threshold at the beginning of the spring term.

I urge your support of this proposal.

Bernard Franklin (Virginia Union University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 19.

This proposal sends a message that we have academic expectations of our student-athletes, regardless of whether they are competing or practicing. By specifying that minimum grade-point-average requirements are calculated based on completed credit hours, as opposed to seasons of competition, we will be basing our requirements on what a student has done academically and not based on what a student has done athletically.

We will demonstrate to not only prospective student-athletes but also current student-athletes, that it is important to meet continuing-eligibility requirements, regardless of whether you have been involved in intercollegiate competition during the academic year.

Please join the Management Council and Presidents Council in support of this proposal.

Dede Allen (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 19. Basing the standard for grade-point-average requirements on credit hours earned, and not seasons of competition, will eliminate the confusion regarding the application of this legislation.

Further, in all areas of satisfactory progress, we certify our student-athletes based on credit hours; however, for grade-point average, we have been using seasons of competition.

It is in the spirit of deregulation to bring consistency to the certification of satisfactory progress for student-athletes. It is also important to note that there is an editorial revision in Section C, indicating that "at the completion of 72-semester," and it should read, 108-quarter hours, not 98.

I urge your support of Proposal 19.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 19 was adopted, 227-5-1.]

ELIGIBILITY – SATISFACTORY PROGRESS – FULFILLMENT OF MINIMUM GRADE-POINT-AVERAGE REQUIREMENTS

Kevin Hickey (Assumption College): On behalf of the Division II Academic Requirements Committee and the Division II Management Council, I move Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will strengthen the satisfactory-progress requirements to help ensure that student-athletes are in a position to graduate.

The current standards require a student-athlete to present a minimum grade-point average of 1.6 after the first season of competition, 1.8 after the second season of competition, and a 2.0 after the third and subsequent season of competition.

The Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council believe the current requirements are insufficient to put a Division II student-athlete in the best position to graduate. The increased requirements to 1.8 and 1.9 will help ensure that student-athletes can be successful in achieving their academic goals. It is important to note that this proposal does not change the current requirements that student-athletes must present a grade-point average of 2.0 after their third and subsequent season of competition.

Finally, this proposal has an effective date of August 1, 2004, in order to give sufficient time and notice for meeting the new standards.

For all the reasons I have stated, I urge you to vote in support of Proposal 20.

Frank Brown (Columbus State University): On behalf of the Division II Presidents

Council, I urge the support of our delegates for Proposal No. 20.

Each of us has a responsibility to ensure we are preparing our student-athletes for graduation from our colleges and universities. We have set standards and academic expectations for our student-athletes with regard to initial eligibility by requiring them to satisfy a grade-point average of 2.0, with an SAT score of 820 or an ACT sum score of 68. If we have set standards and expectations in order to better ensure prospective student-athletes' success in their first years of enrollment at our colleges and universities, then we should also set standards and expectations which are high enough to better ensure their continued success once they have entered our institutions.

Helping place a student-athlete in a better position to graduate is not just an academic issue, but also a student-athlete welfare issue. Voting in favor of this proposal is one step toward placing our student-athletes in a position to better help themselves succeed in the broader world. It is one step I'm asking my fellow delegates to join as we vote in support of Proposal No. 20.

John Keating (University of Wisconsin, Parkside): Also on behalf of the Division II Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 20.

The Presidents Council is in agreement with the Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council. The current standards are not rigorous enough to put a Division II student-athlete in a position to graduate in a timely manner. By increasing the minimum grade-point average requirements to a 1.8 and a 1.9 after a student-athlete's first and second seasons of competition, we are demonstrating that we have academic expectations of our student-athletes.

This proposal makes sound academic sense by ensuring our student-athletes achieve their academic goals. For this reason, and for the reasons previously stated by my colleagues, I urge your support of this proposal.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 20 was adopted, 218-14-4.]

SATISFACTORY PROGRESS – FULFILLMENT OF GRADE-POINT-AVERAGE REQUIREMENTS

John Powell (University of South Dakota): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is offered in the spirit of deregulation and specifies that in determining the minimum grade-point-average requirement, institutions must use the same grade-point average calculation used to calculate cumulative grade-point averages for the general student body. By creating such a standard, the regulation of academic eligibility is placed back with the institution, but nonetheless, ensures that student-athletes are treated in the same manner as all students.

For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal 21.

Pamela Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): On behalf of the Division II Management Council, I urge you to support Proposal No. 21.

As indicated by John Powell, this proposal deregulates the bylaw pertaining to minimum grade-point averages, by allowing institutions to calculate a student-athlete's cumulative grade-point average by the same method used to calculate the cumulative grade-point averages for the student body generally.

This proposal further simplifies the calculation process by including only those courses completed at the certifying institution.

One of the primary principles of the NCAA is that student-athletes are held to the same

standards as those of the general student body. This proposal fulfills this principle and at the same time furthers Division II's commitment to deregulation.

For these reasons, and those stated previously, please support the adoption of Proposal 21.

Larry Blumberg (Washburn University of Topeka): I need a clarification.

At our institution, the overall GPA for all students is computed by all courses taken at any institution. If we have a student-athlete who goes home over the summer and takes a course at a nearby school and transfers it back, do I have to then back that out of the calculations for the GPA or do I use what the normal GPA is?

Ms. Cormier: Thank you for your question. We'll be asking for an interpretation here. Just give our folks one minute to do this.

Missy McCracken (NCAA Staff): There is a distinction to be made between the method of calculation and the courses that you're using in that calculation. The method of calculation is, for example, whether your university assigned the number 4 to all level of A's, for A-, A, and A+, or whether you give weighted course work, et cetera. It's the method that you're using.

What courses are to be included when you use that method is separate from that calculation method.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. Blumberg: So I have to back it out?

Ms. McCracken: Yes, you would be required to only use courses taken at the certifying institution for purposes of figuring their GPA.

Mr. Blumberg: That makes it more complicated than it is now.

Ms. Cormier: At least you have it clarified.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 21 was adopted, 220-10-1.]

ELIGIBILITY – SATISFACTORY-PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS – REGULATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

If adopted, this proposal eliminates the requirement that prior approval be granted for summer courses completed at another institution, even if they are to be used in determining a student-athlete's academic status.

The Legislation Committee and the Councils agreed that the use of such summer courses should be an institutional decision and should be handled using the policies applied to all students.

Transferring the discretion back to the institution will not be difficult, as many institutions currently have articulation agreements which include lists of transferrable courses. This should result in less work for compliance officers, and instead, leave the responsibility with faculty, the registrar or the appropriate academic office on campus. This proposal represents the continued efforts to deregulate legislation that requires unnecessary and repetitive documentation.

Waivers when courses have not been preapproved are currently reviewed by the Academics Requirement Committee Subcommittee on Satisfactory Progress and are routinely approved. This proposal will eliminate the need for this process.

Please join me in supporting Proposal No. 22.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 22 was adopted, 224-10-0.]

TRANSFER REGULATIONS – FULFILLMENT OF RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT IN NIGHT SCHOOL

Kim Vinson (Cameron University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal deregulates the requirements relating to a transfer student-athlete serving his or her year of residence through a night school program or the completion of night course work.

Initially, legislation was warranted to address disparities that existed among night school programs at Division II institutions. For example, some institutions did not consider night school students full-time or regularly matriculated. However, as many of us recognize, most institutions now offer ample course work at night. In most cases, that course work is identical to day courses, is taught by the same professors, and students in the night courses receive the same credit and have the same status as day students.

Please note the legislation outlining a year in academic residency is not altered by this proposal. Thus, it remains that in order to receive credit toward a year of residence, a student-athlete will still need to be enrolled as a full-time student at the Division II institution. Again, the initial oversight over night school programs is no longer warranted or necessary.

Finally, allowing institutions rather than the NCAA to determine the validity of night course work as it pertains to the fulfillment of the one-year residency requirement furthers Division II's commitment to deregulation.

For these reasons, and those stated previously, please support the adoption of Proposal No. 23.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 23 was adopted, 219-1-4.]

TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS – QUALIFIERS, PARTIAL QUALIFIERS AND NONQUALIFIERS

Paul Engelmann (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 24 simplifies our legislation by establishing a common rule for eligibility for competition for qualifiers, partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers who transfer to the certifying institution from a two-year college. Currently, a qualifier who has not graduated from the two-year college must satisfactorily complete 24 hours of transferrable course work, whereas a partial or nonqualifier must present 24 hours of transferrable course work and average 12 hours of transferrable course work per semester of full-time attendance.

This proposal will simplify the administration of the bylaw, a goal of deregulation. It also strengthens our academic requirements. For example, under current legislation, a qualifier who goes to a two-year college and attends for three semesters, would have to present only 24 semester hours of acceptable transferred credit, while a partial or nonqualifier would have to present 36 hours of acceptable transferred credit. Under this proposal, both would be required to present 36 semester hours of work.

Thus, the proposal recognizes our belief that once you enter a collegiate environment, your eligibility to participate in intercollegiate athletics should be placed on your collegiate academic record, not your high-school academic record.

Note that the proposal does not change the distinctions that currently exist between qualifiers, partials and nonqualifiers regarding the effects if you fail to meet the proposal.

I urge your support.

Lea Rudee (University of California, San Diego): There's a significant problem for those of us in California with this proposal. In one of the cases, it would favor transfer students from four-year schools into one of our campuses over transfers from community colleges.

In California, since the mid '50s, we've been governed by a state law called the Donahue Act, the master plan for higher education in the state of California. One of its precepts is that there can be no distinction between transferring from two-year and four-year schools. In fact, the transfer of community college students is favored.

Those of us at the University of California are challenged to have 60 percent juniors and seniors, and only 40 percent freshmen and sophomores, with that difference coming from community colleges. To show that we take this seriously, UC Berkeley, which is the most difficult state-supported school for admissions in the United States, has 60 percent juniors and seniors and does a very active transfer program. So this puts us in the difficult position. If we follow the letter of this in every case, we will be in violation of state law.

Clinton Pettus (Cheyney University of Pennsylvania): I'm standing to represent the Presidents Council on behalf of Proposal 24.

The ultimate goal of deregulation is simplification of the legislation. This proposal is at the heart of deregulation. It will make the application and understanding of the legislation for a two-year college transfer straightforward. This proposal will hold all two-year transfers to the same set of requirements, regardless of the student's initial-eligibility status.

Because the current requirements are not dramatically different for qualifiers, partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers, it just makes sense that we should apply the same standard across the board for all two-year college transfer students in order to facilitate the administration of the legislation by our institutions.

If your goal for deregulation is simplification, then I urge your support of Proposal No. 24, because simplification is exactly what this proposal was meant to accomplish. Thank you.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 24 was adopted, 207-21-5.]

TRANSFERS – 4-2-4 TRANSFERS

Michael Kovalchik (Hillsdale College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee and Management Council, I would like to move Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was another step in the deregulation effort to addressing Bylaw 14, Eligibility - Academic and General Requirements. This proposal would simplify the current transfer legislation, whereby the appropriate transfer category would be determined solely by the classification of the institution the student-athlete most recently attended.

For example, a 4-2-4 transfer would have to satisfy the 2-4 requirements. All transfer exceptions for 2-4 and 4-4 transfers would remain, and transfer of student-athletes would have to satisfy a transfer exception, based on the classification of the most recent institution attended or serve a one-year residence at the certifying institution.

This deregulation proposal would not create a competitive disadvantage. I strongly urge your support.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 25 was adopted, 226-6-1.]

ELIGIBILITY – TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS – COMPETITION IN YEAR OF TRANSFER

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal permits student-athletes from two-year colleges who transfer in the middle of the academic year and are otherwise eligible to participate in the championship segment of the season at the certifying institution, as long as the student-athlete has not competed during the championship segment at the two-year college during the same academic year.

In addition, this proposal permits student-athletes from two-year colleges who transfer in the middle of the academic year and are otherwise eligible to participate in the non-championship segment at the certifying institution, regardless of the amount of competition they have engaged in at the two-year college.

Current regulations specify that such a transfer student is not permitted to compete if he or she has participated in any competition other than two preseason scrimmages at the two-year college in that sport during the same academic year.

This proposal brings consistency to the rules regarding competition in the year of transfer, to situations involving both two- and four-year college transfers. There is no competitive advantage in allowing a two-year college transfer student-athlete to compete in a non-championship segment at a two-year college, and then allowing the same student-athlete to compete in the championship segment at the certifying institution during the same academic year.

Likewise, there is no competitive advantage in allowing a transfer student-athlete to compete in a nonchampionship segment of a certifying institution.

Further, this proposal eliminates the difficulty institutions face in determining whether the two-year college scrimmages trigger application of the competition of the year of transfer rule.

For these reasons, and I hope you understood them, I urge you to support this proposal.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 26 was adopted, 231-4-2.]

PERMISSIBLE BENEFITS – COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS – CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIPS

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

If adopted, this proposal will make it permissible for the institution to provide complimentary tickets for conference championship events. This is permissive legislation. It is not mandatory. It creates an opportunity to give student-athletes these complimentary tickets for use by their friends and family who attend those championships.

Conference championships are very similar to NCAA championships and bowl games, during which student-athletes already may receive the complimentary admissions. This proposal would bring consistency to the provision of complimentary tickets to similar post-season events and would provide deserving student-athletes with a reasonable additional benefit.

I urge your support for this proposal and point out that this does not mean that con-

ferences would have to provide the free tickets. It simply opens the option to member institutions to purchase those tickets and then enable them to give them to the student-athletes. Thank you.

Janel McNeal (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The institutions in the conference we represent support Proposal No. 27. However, after further evaluation, the Division II National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes this legislation. The legislation causes an unfair recruiting advantage for the schools that have the resources to provide the tickets and choose to use them as benefits for student-athletes.

Also, the proposal could potentially create an inequity between student-athletes from different schools competing in the same conference, based purely on the decisions and resources that the institutions could choose to use, thus widening the gap between schools that are well funded and those that are not.

Again, we choose to oppose this legislation and we wish you do as well.

Paul Engelmann (Central Missouri State University): I would remind the membership that right now you are already permitted to grant four of these admissions. The only thing we are doing is making all of the postseason constant at six, so that you don't have to keep in mind that you can give four for the conference and six for the bowl game or NCAA postseason competition.

[SAAC Position: Oppose.]

[Proposal No. 27 was defeated, 97-135-5.]

EMERGING SPORTS – EQUESTRIAN AND RUGBY

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): On behalf of the Management Council, it gives me great pleasure to move Proposal 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

It's obvious that a lot of people in this audience know that equestrian is near and dear to my heart, right? In an effort to increase participation of female athletes, equestrian has been identified as an emerging sport. Currently, there are 40 member institutions—and I have business cards, by the way, of a few more that are interested—in Division I, Division II and Division III that are sponsoring equestrian.

Adding equestrian to the list of emerging sports for women will provide institutions an additional sport to meet sports sponsorship requirements. Further, it will also foster an environment in which greater opportunities for student-athletes to participate in intercollegiate athletics can be achieved.

At this point I'm not personally moving rugby, but a lot of my friends out here do love rugby.

Ms. Cormier: Some of us are rugby addicts.

Mr. Harris: That's right. I would like to address rugby. In an effort to increase opportunities for female athletes, rugby has also been identified as an emerging sport. The Committee on Women's Athletics believes that we have received appropriate documentation to include this in our sports offerings.

Adding rugby to the list of emerging sports for women will provide institutions an additional sport to meet sport sponsorship requirements. Further, it will foster an environment in which greater opportunities for student-athletes to participate in intercollegiate athletics can be achieved.

I strongly urge your support in both these sports. Thank you. (Applause.)

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 28 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS – FIRST DATE OF PRACTICE – FALL SPORTS

Ms. Cormier: Proposal No. 36, Part C, is a football-only vote. There will be two votes. We will consider Part C separately from the other sections of Proposal No. 36. Only those schools sponsoring football as a varsity sport are permitted to participate in the paddle vote for Part C.

Proposal No. 36 must be moved and seconded before amendment-to-amendment No. 36-1 can be considered. The Presidents Council has agreed to support Proposal No. 36 if it is amended by Proposal No. 36-1. Also please note that Proposal No. 29, Part A, as referenced in the Convention handout will be moot if Proposal No. 36, Part C, is approved.

Thomas Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I would like to move Proposal No. 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to level the playing field on the starting dates of practice for the fall sports of cross country, field hockey, football, soccer, and women's volleyball. We urge acceptance.

Paul Engelmann (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal 36-1, which is an amendment-to-the-amendment of Proposal No. 36. It's included in that handout you received this morning.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 36-1 is a significant change to Proposal 36. As it currently reads, Proposal 36 would require each institution to count back 21 calendar days from the institution's first contest date in each sport in order to determine the institution's first permissible practice date.

The amendment-to-amendment sponsored by the Management Council would amend Proposal 36 to require institutions to count back 21 calendar days from the Division II legislated first permissible contest date in order to determine the first permissible practice date for all Division II institutions.

The return to counting as a way of determining an institution's first permissible practice date should not cause concern. It is not taking us back to the days when we counted practice opportunities, which we all know was very confusing. This change is a counting of calendar days, which would be very simple. In fact, the dates of the first permissible practice could be printed in the Manual years in advance.

Undoubtedly, there are some delegates who prefer the common August 10 start date we passed last year. However, even if you feel that way, please support this amendment-to-amendment in order that we do not return to a situation in which each institution must compute a separate practice start date for each sport based upon that sport's first date of competition.

This amendment to amendment is in the spirit of deregulation and would create a consistent start date for practice across all Division II schools for all fall sports.

On behalf of the Management Council and the Legislation Committee, I recommend your support of Proposal 36-1.

Ross Brummett (Carson-Newman College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to support 36-1 for several of the reasons that Paul just outlined.

Proposal 36, as written, appears to re-regulate the playing and practice-season legislation only one year after we deregulated it. However, 36-1 amends 36 in a manner which allows us to retain the simple core of what we did last year—namely, establishing one uniform start date for all fall sports.

By changing the first permissible practice date to a uniform date across the division and across all fall sports, we greatly simplified the determination of when we can start practice. Proposal 36-1 maintains a uniform start date. Passing 36-1 would allow us to publish that start date each year in the Manual. Even if you oppose 36, you ought to support 36-1 so you don't have to go back to calculating a start date for each individual sport.

I urge you to support 36-1.

Sharon Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): At the risk of being accused of losing values and philosophy once one has left the Legislation Committee . . . I served for many years on that committee and totally agree with the idea of simplification and common start dates and so on.

I think we all know that 36-1 is designed to address the football issue. As the chair has indicated, this will be voted separately for football and then the other four sections relating to all the other fall sports. The Football Project Team has made a compelling case for the additional dates required for the acclimatization in the sport of football—for the equipment, for the energy expenditure, for whatever the issues were that were dealt with over the course of a year—statistics, studies and everything like that.

Now, for the sake of keeping the common start date, we are going to pull the rest of the fall sports to that even earlier date. While, as I said, I support that common start date, I really believe in this case that the cost that will be attendant to that, with the proper reasons for the sport of football, do not compel me to vote to move all of the other sports.

For an institution that sponsors my sport of field hockey and begins classes the day after Labor Day, this would afford between 56 and 84 practices for field hockey prior to the start of classes. That's whether the institution chooses to run double or triple sessions. That is done without any of the safeguards for the heat, for any other exercise reasons that have been attached to the football proposal. I think that the two things are not offsetting enough to change this date. I urge the Division II membership to support Part C, which applies to football, and to defeat A, B, D and E.

Cameron MacDonald (Heartland Conference): I represent the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 36-1 for the following reason: We are supporting this amendment contingent on the passage of Proposal 36-C. Our primary concern is the health and safety of football players. This change will potentially allow for that goal to be achieved.

However, we are concerned about the implications this legislation may have for other fall sports, especially the additional time demands this may solicit. We do encourage your support for this proposal.

Ms. Cormier: Thank you.

We're going to do Proposal No. 36-1. This is a paddle vote. Only the football schools can vote on this. This is the amendment-to-amendment that you are voting on first, Part C.

Nathan Salant (Gulf Southern Conference): A quick procedural question. Is it only the member institutions that sponsor the sport, or is it also the conferences that conduct a championship in it that may vote? It was my understanding that if a conference sponsored the championship, it also was entitled to vote.

Ms. Cormier: Both may vote.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Part C of Proposal No. 36-1 was adopted.]

Ms. Cormier: We will now vote on Proposal No. 36-1, Parts A, B, D and E. We're ready to vote. Everyone votes on these, not just football schools.

All in favor please raise your paddles; all opposed please raise your paddles. The ruling is that it passes. Thank you.

Someone has asked for a roll call, so we will do that. Our parliamentarian has ruled that we can do that. Please cast your vote.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Parts A, B, D and E of Proposal No. 36-1 were adopted, 135-98-1.]

We're now going to vote on Proposal No. 36, as amended by 36-1. We're going to take it in the same way that we did before, which means that you'll be voting first on Part C. Football schools and conferences only will vote on this. We'll do a paddle vote. All in favor please raise your paddles; all opposed. That motion passes.

You're now voting on Proposal No. 36 A, B, D and E. This is a paddle vote. All in favor please raise your paddles; all opposed.

Our parliamentarian is suggesting that we do a roll call on this one. Again, you're voting with your machines on Proposal No. 36 A, B, D and E.

The motion passes.

We'll now move to Proposal No. 29. This is a paddle vote. It is a football-only vote.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS – FOOTBALL – PRESEASON CONDITIONING

Jerry McGee (Wingate University): On behalf of the Division II Football Issues Project Team and the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal amends the Division II preseason football practice legislation in a manner that minimizes the health and safety risks for student-athletes while providing adequate preparation time for regular-season football.

The Division II Football Issues Project Team believes such legislation is necessary to address health and safety concerns for Division II football student-athletes. If this proposal is adopted, we could enter the upcoming football season with the satisfaction that we have taken action to make Division II football a safer sport.

With this proposed legislation, we will have put into place, based on the best science available, the practice schedule that puts the health and safety of football student-athletes as a top priority.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

Pamela Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 29.

When considering this proposal, it's very important to note the following: No. 1, the rate of heat illness in Division II football, which permits shoulder pads on the first three days of fall practice, is four times greater than the rate of heat illness in Division III, which allows only helmets on the first days of practice. No. 2, in preseason football practice, a student-athlete is almost four times as likely to have a reportable injury of any kind than in the regular season. No. 3, 91 percent, 165 out of 181, of all fall heat illness reports were from the sport of football. Only nine percent of all reported heat illnesses occurred in the other fall sports.

In conclusion, the NCAA's injury surveillance data provides evidence that general acclimatization to football practice without equipment results in less heat illness. The high preseason injury rate relative to the regular season may be reduced by modifying the frequency of double sessions in preseason practices to emphasize recovery. During the pre-season practice period, football student-athletes practice during intense heat and humidity for long hours, while wearing significant amounts of protective equipment.

This proposal, developed by the Division II Football Project Team, helps balance the competitive needs of the sport with the health and safety needs of student-athletes. The project team included coaches and representatives from every Division II football playing

conference. In addition, the NCAA Competitive Safeguards Committee has reviewed the Division II proposal and endorses it as a good legislation.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): As I mentioned a couple days ago at the issues forum on football, this legislation reminds me of a practice many years ago when I was an athlete, when many student-athletes fell to heat illness, to such an extent that practice had to be halted.

It also tells me why I'm not a fan of the recent ESPN show, "The Junction Boys," because it brought back those bad memories. Thankfully, we've learned from those experiences. However, there has actually been little actual scientific research for this very specific topic. I applaud the NCAA sport sciences offices for taking this under their purview.

All those who play football understand that there are inherent risks when you go to the edge of physical capabilities. That is why this is important legislation. It is why I study it so closely. It is why I state it is an excellent start. It is also why I state my concern on the specificity that would be included under 17.11.2.3.B, that's a lot of letters and numbers, specifically to the one practice per day, for up to three years during the acclimatization period.

I urge the membership and the NCAA sports sciences office to collaborate and continue this work, and work with Dr. Sandra Godek of West Chester University. She is currently completing ground-breaking physiological research on this specific topic under a grant by the NFL. She tells me this research will be ready for presentation later this spring. She would be happy to work with the NCAA and its membership in an effort to craft legislation that continues to meet our goal of safe practices for all football players.

With this in mind, I also plead that we do so and go forward with this, with the understanding that the membership will stand willing to make changes in this legislation if needed, based upon the recommendation of this research.

Finally, I plead with each of you to be ready and willing to pay the special attention necessary to your football practice schedules and the preparations to combat heat illness. I do so, and I say so, because lives are at stake. Thank you.

Ms. Cormier: Thank you.

Bernard Franklin (Virginia Union University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 29.

This proposal is based on a sound study of preseason conditioning activities. The study involved input from sports medicine staff, student-athletes, coaches and administrators. This proposal is an attempt to improve student-athlete welfare by reducing the risk of injury and heat illness during Division II preseason football practices.

In 2001-02, the NCAA injury surveillance system showed, on average, more than one time loss heat illness per Division II school during preseason practice. In fact, the rate of heat illness reported in Division II football is greater than any other fall sport and is greater than the rate of heat illness reported in Division I football.

A five-day period to acclimate to equipment and exercise intensity at the start of formal preseason practice will minimize the risk of such illnesses. In addition, 2001 and 2002 ISS data show a four times higher risk of time loss injuries, including heat illnesses in the pre-season, than during the regular season.

Enhanced recovery during preseason practice, by modifying the schedule of double or multiple practices on one day, further minimizes the risk for all injuries, including heat-related illnesses. This is the right proposal to adopt to address a very critical issue for our division. For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

Cody Stovall (Lone Star Conference): I'm representing the Division II National Student-Athlete Advisory Council.

I would like to add that Division II does support this proposal, and we feel it is in the best interests of the student-athlete welfare.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 29 was adopted.]

Ms. Cormier: This is the end of the presidential grouping. The remaining proposals will be paddle vote only, unless you feel the need to do otherwise.

We would like to take a very short break. I know you don't like this because you want to keep going, but we have to provide an opportunity for the delegates to caucus so that we can open this up when we return to a window of reconsideration for the presidential grouping, Proposals Nos. 7 through 29, before we proceed to Proposal No. 30.

[Note: The delegates took a brief recess.]

Ms. Cormier: Ladies and gentlemen, please return to the Convention floor. I appreciate your high degree of compliance with this request.

Thank you all very much for coming back. We have a bit more business for the Convention. I would like to entertain a motion for anyone to reconsider, in this window of reconsideration for the presidential grouping, Proposals 7 through 29. Is there anyone who would like to speak to reconsideration of those proposals?

We are now ready to proceed to Proposal No. 30.

RECRUITING – CAMP OR CLINIC – EMPLOYMENT OF PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE

Jim Naumovich (Great Lakes Valley Conference): I move Proposal 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

Sharon Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): Madam President, point of order. There was an individual at Microphone 7. I don't think anyone on the dais spotted him when you called for the reconsideration.

Ms. Cormier: I'm sorry. Was that person for reconsideration? Excuse me.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): I ask for reconsideration of 36 A, B, D and E, and 36-1 A, B, D and E. We were on the prevailing side.

Ms. Cormier: You were on the prevailing side? All right. Not Part C, right?

Mr. Higgins: Not C, no.

Larry Fitzgerald (Parliamentarian): Just so we're clear on it. You want to reconsider 36 as amended, is that correct?

Mr. Higgins: As amended, A, B, D and E.

Mr. Fitzgerald: Then we don't have to deal with the amendment separately. We can just simply deal with 36 as amended, as to the motion to reconsider. Everything but C, correct?

Mr. Higgins: I believe so. You're getting rather technical on me. Yes.

Ms. Cormier: All right. There has been a request. I think we should do a roll-call vote on this, but I guess we can discuss it first. Is there anyone else who would like to speak to this?

Mr. Higgins: I'll speak very briefly about it. I did have some discussions with some members of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee outside, and in listening to them speak earlier today, they were in opposition to the specific items in A, B, D and E.

We do have anecdotal scientific research regarding Item 36-c. We do have information that states that there's a reason and rationale behind that. Bringing everybody in, or having the opportunity to bring everybody in, I do not believe is in the best interests of everybody at all times, to lump all the practices together. I simply stand and state my point in that respect. Thank you.

Hopefully, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee will speak to it as well. I believe in standing behind what they say most of the time. I definitely agree this time.

Cameron MacDonald (Heartland Conference): I represent the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I want to reiterate the gentleman's point.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal 36-c, but strongly opposes Proposal 36-a, -b, -d and -e. We agree that 36-c addresses increasing concerns of health and safety for football players. We do not feel these concerns transcend to the other four sports. The additional time demands and the possibility of institutional abuse this proposal would place on student-athletes in the other four sports is unfair and unjustified. The student-athlete position is very clear. We implore you to reject Proposal 36 as it applies to Parts A, B, D and E.

Jane Meier (Northern Kentucky University): I strongly urge the body to remember that last year we voted for some very good legislation with a starting date of August 10. Again, I'm in favor of football because it makes sense. It just makes sense. But for the other sports, I just see it as costly. They could practice with as many opportunities. I think Sharon Taylor brought that up. We need to keep some things in mind.

I urge you to be sure to remember, we had good legislation last year. I urge you to defeat this legislation. Thank you.

Steve Murray (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I just want to remind everybody, last year when we passed August 10, I think for most fall sports, we added practice opportunities for all the fall sports, at the convenience of a single date. No one is going to argue with that.

We can still do single dates. We can print 10 pages into the year 3000 of what day football starts, what day all the other sports start. But to extend practice opportunities for the other sports, at the convenience of one extra few lines in the Manual, doesn't make sense.

The student-athletes are saying in the sports other than football, a compelling argument has not been made. It's in the best interests of the student-athletes' welfare to defeat Parts A, B, D and E.

Tia Brandel (Ferris State University): Actually, it wasn't extending practice for all other fall sports since volleyball had a reduction in their practice time and there was an increase for the other fall sports.

Researching this out over the next 25 years, using the August 10 start date, the number of days of practice varies between 15 and 22. Using the start date that we have, hopefully you won't pass No. 37, that inconsistent length of time is rather difficult for many coaches and many programs to run. Counting back 21 days from the first permissible day of practice allows a consistent number of practice days each year, each season, for all sports.

If you look out over the next 25 years, which I have done all that research, you will see that you actually start before August 10 only three or four years out of every seven years. You start right at August 10 or 11 the other years. So there really isn't a great difference if you use August 10, or count back 21 days. It just keeps you from having those years where you only have 15 days.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): Can I just make sure we clarify that we're voting to actually reconsider? Am I correct? We're not voting on the actual items themselves?

Ms. Cormier: Correct. That is correct. The vote is to reconsider.

[The motion to reconsider was approved.]

Sharon Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): For all the reasons already expressed in the discussion on reconsidering, I would urge the membership to defeat Parts A, B, D and E.

Thomas Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): We had proposed this amendment because we wanted to level the playing field for the number of days that they

could practice. With Thanksgiving being a determining date of when the tournaments are, we end up with either longer days of opportunity or shorter days. Tia had brought up the fact before that the number of days in one of those shorter periods of time, could be as little as 15.

The other part of it is that August 10, or first day of class, gives some advantage to those people who start earlier in the fall with their fall term or semester. The reason we proposed that, was to level the field, make it 21 days, and with the hope of 37 passing, that would dictate when you could start. Now, that's when you could start. It doesn't mean you have to start.

[Proposal No. 36 as amended, was defeated.]

Edward Matejkovic (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): I have a question. I don't know if I'm out of order.

We passed earlier legislation in 19 and 20. One was tied to seasons of competition, the other was tied to grade-point average. As I think this through, what I see is that if I had two freshman football players who were roommates, and one played his freshman year, and one didn't play his freshman year, and let's say I had a kicker who played and he got a 1.7, he would be ineligible, but if I had a quarterback who was redshirted and 1.6, he would be eligible.

I know the effective date of the second piece of legislation is not until 2004, but I think we did something here that kind of squeezes people together. Am I right? Is my thinking off? Or do we have time to fix this in a year?

Ms. Cormier: We're not quite sure we understand your question.

Mr. Matejkovic: In 19 and 20, we said in 19, that after 24 credits hours, you would have to have a 1.6. But in 20, if you played after one season of competition, you would have to have a 1.8 grade-point average.

So given the same set of circumstances, one freshman plays, and one doesn't and one would be eligible, and wouldn't be eligible.

Missy McCracken (NCAA Staff): No, 19 and 20 were both adopted. The first part of that bylaw is not based on seasons of competition any longer. It's based on credit hours.

Mr. Matejkovic: Right.

Ms. McCracken: So it would be credit hours on the 1.8. So that's handled in your FAQ document. Number six explains how it would work. It's actually laid out exactly how the legislation will read.

Mr. Matejkovic: We wouldn't find ourselves in that situation?

Ms. McCracken: No, because it's based on credit hours and not seasons of competition. It wouldn't have anything to do with whether a student-athlete was redshirted.

Mr. Matejkovic: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Cormier: All right. We are now ready for Proposal No. 30.

RECRUITING – CAMP OR CLINIC – EMPLOYMENT OF PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE

Jim Naumovich (Great Lakes Valley Conference): I move Proposal 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

At this time I would also like to move Proposal 30-1 as an amendment-to-amendment.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 30-1 should be applicable only to prospective student-athletes in basketball to better reflect the intent of the original proposal.

The proposal was submitted by the Women's Basketball Coaches Association and was strongly supported by the WBCA membership.

Given the number of Division II institutions which sponsor basketball, it is likely the sponsorship of summer basketball camps is greater than other sports. I urge your support of 30-1.

Katy Wilson (Minnesota State University Moorhead): Do I understand correctly, we are on 30-1?

Ms. Cormier: Yes, we're on 30-1 at the moment.

Ms. Wilson: On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to oppose Proposal No. 30-1.

The Management Council and Presidents Council oppose Proposal No. 30, which would permit all prospective student-athletes in any sport to be employed at an institution summer camp or clinic for up to a total of 10 days, provided the prospective student-athletes have signed a national letter of intent. This proposal would limit it to only prospective student-athletes in the sport of basketball. For the same reasons that we opposed Proposal No. 30, we oppose Proposal No. 30-1.

In addition, we have attempted to get away from carving out exceptions for each sport. This amendment-to-amendment creates yet another exception for the sport of basketball. By limiting the legislation to only prospective student-athletes in the sport of basketball, you have only made what was bad legislation worse.

For this reason, I urge your opposition of this proposal. Thank you.

Angela Desmarais (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I represent the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC opposes Proposal 30-1 for the following reasons: Out of the best interests of student-athlete welfare, we feel this proposal may be abused by institutions, based on what constitutes the activities taking place in and out of working hours.

The proposal opens the opportunity for open gyms and coach-less practices during camps that may discriminate against the player and effectively put judgment on a player's ability and/or presence at the event.

Further, student-athletes may forfeit another summer job to participate in camps and/or feel obliged to the program, in fear of being discriminated against based on attendance or lack thereof.

Furthermore, the proposal unreasonably isolates basketball, therefore running counter to the Division II philosophy of creating sports equally.

We urge your opposition on Proposal 30-1, along with 30.

John Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I speak as a faculty representative in opposing 30-1 and 30.

This is another example of more, more, more. More time involved with athletics, more money involved. We'd like to stop this train of professionalism. More and more time. This is an example of less is better. Thank you.

[SAAC Position: Oppose.]

[Proposal No. 30-1 was defeated.]

RECRUITING – WOMEN'S BASKETBALL – DEAD PERIOD

Jim Naumovich (Great Lakes Valley Conference): I move Proposal 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

At this time I would also like to move Proposal 31-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment-to-amendment would make the change in the recruiting calendar effective immediately.

This legislation was also proposed by the WBCA in an attempt to increase attendance of Division II coaches to their annual convention. Presently, the WBCA convention and NCAA Division I Women's Final Four take place during the contact period on the recruiting calendar. A dead period would allow coaches the opportunity to attend the convention without feeling they are at a recruiting disadvantage. I urge the adoption of Proposal 31-1.

Sue Willey (University of Indianapolis): To help Jim get over his last defeat, on behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 31-1.

This will permit Division II women's basketball coaches the opportunity to attend the Women's Basketball Coaches Association convention this year without having to wait for the 2004 women's basketball convention. It only makes sense that we would want our coaches to have the advantage of this legislation immediately.

In order to produce the intended benefit of the increased participation at the basketball coaches convention, I urge your support of this amendment-to-the-amendment.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 31-1 was adopted.]

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 31 was adopted.]

RECRUITING CALENDAR – WOMEN'S BASKETBALL, AAU EVENTS

David Brunk (Northeast-10 Conference): I would like to move Proposal 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Northeast-10 Conference would like to move for an immediate effective date in order to enable the women's basketball coaches the opportunity to effectively evaluate and utilize Proposal No. 32, instead of waiting until the '04 year.

Ms. Cormier: The first thing we're going to do is vote on the immediate effective date if we're ready to do that. This is a paddle vote. It must be a two-thirds vote. All in favor please raise your paddles; all opposed please raise your paddles. The immediate effective date passes.

We will now vote on the merits of the proposal.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 32 was adopted.]

FINANCIAL AID – EXEMPTED GOVERNMENT GRANTS – STATE GRANTS

Jerry Hughes (Central Missouri State University): On the behalf of the sponsors, I'd like to move Proposal No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

A couple years ago, we excluded similar grants from counting toward individual and team limits.

Increasingly, state governments are establishing state grants based upon students' academic achievements and/or need to be used at any institution within that state. Institutions have no impact into who qualifies for such programs. Therefore, there is no recruiting advantage to be gained by any institution within that state.

As a student welfare issue, these grants should be excluded from the individual and team limits, as are similar existing federal programs. Obviously, the federal costs of attendance figure at each institution could not be exceeded.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 33.

John Powell (University of South Dakota): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 33.

Increasingly, state governments are establishing financial aid programs, in which state grants are provided based on ability and/or academic achievement to students who are residents of the state. However, most states stipulate that these grants must be used at a school within the state.

Currently, the legislation provides that if the grant restricted the recipient's institution, the aid is not exempted from financial aid limits. However, some states allow these same types of grants to be used wherever the student chooses; therefore, the grant is exempt from institutional limits.

This proposal is intended to exempt government grants to student-athletes whose choice of institution is restricted to an institution within a specified state, so long as the other provisions are met.

This would be consistent with how we treat other government grants that are provided on ability and/or academic achievement and that are not administered by the institution.

As a student-athlete welfare issue, these grants should be excluded from individual and team limits, as are similar existing federal grants.

Juan Bovell (Gulf South Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We support Proposal No. 33 for the following reasons. Student-athletes should not be penalized by withholding possible financial assistance. The fact that they have met state or national requirements to earn such awards, should be applauded.

Supporting this proposal would allow student-athletes to receive funds to contribute to their academic expenses which are not otherwise covered by their athletic scholarships. Further, many student-athletes prefer to pursue their education close to home. Currently, student-athletes who earn such rewards may be forced to go out of state to attend school. This proposal would allow student-athletes to remain in their home state and still receive their rewards.

We encourage you to support this piece of legislation. Thank you.

Kent Weiser (Emporia State University): I'd like to speak in opposition to 33.

Although we agree that these types of state awards should be exempted from team limits, they are dissimilar to the federal programs that are need based. You're allowing a reason, other than financial need, to take an individual over a full grant-in-aid.

It also creates somewhat of a competitive disadvantage for states that do not have those kinds of programs or private institutions within states that might not qualify for those types of grants.

Edward Hammond (Fort Hays State University): Would it be permissible to ask a question of the sponsor?

Ms. Cormier: Of course.

Mr. Hammond: Do they know how many of the 50 states have such programs?

Mr. Hughes: I don't know, Ed. I do not know how many states have that.

Mr. Hammond: Sir, the concern that I have is that the current wording of 15.2.4.1 only applies to federal grants that apply to all 50 states. If we enter into this particular resolution, as proposed, a few states would have a competitive advantage against those states that don't have such programs.

So I would ask that we vote against it and maintain programs that only apply to every state.

Paul Engelmann (Central Missouri State University): I would remind the delegates that under our current rules, the only reason these grants are not excludeable from financial aid is that states wanting to keep their good students in state have, if you will, given them a reward for staying in state.

For staying in that state, they then must give up this grant if it takes them beyond the NCAA's definition of a full grant-in-aid. Obviously, they cannot exceed the federal definition

of the cost of attendance. So to participate in athletics, they may be required to give up money that otherwise they could receive.

We think that it's a student-athlete welfare issue. I urge your support.

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): Many states have developed these programs over the last few years to try to encourage more students to complete college prep courses in high school and proceed to college. These programs are being sold. Texas has one of these programs now to increase the number of kids that are going on to higher education. I commend the states for this.

It has nothing whatsoever to do with athletics participation. It has to do with completing a college prep course at a certain grade-point average in almost every state and having a need.

What's happening in some states now is that then it's running into financial aid for student-athletes. Clearly, this is a way to help those students in those states. It does not help us in athletics. If you note, the legislation itself is meant to exempt those state grants where the state selects the recipients. The legislation will not permit an institution to exempt a state grant if the institution is picking the recipient or determining the criteria for the award.

In other words, the money comes from the state. If the institutions have an opportunity to decide what criteria, where athletics could have some input, then that would still be countable aid.

This is taking care of that. It's given to students on the basis of their high-school performance and their need. I urge your support.

Kent Weiser (Emporia State University): In opposition to 33, if it were written that it's exempted from team limits, then a student-athlete with a partial athletic scholarship could, indeed, keep the award, and it would not change the equivalency.

We're talking about when they say a student-athlete couldn't keep it, they must already be on full athletic scholarship. If they have not proven financial need, then we're allowing that to go over what a full scholarship limitation is. It's not like we're taking money out of student-athletes' hands. But for those individuals who are on full, you reduce the amount of athletic aid and give it to somebody else. I think that's what we're trying to do. Thank you.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 33 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS – BASKETBALL – CONFERENCE CHALLENGE TOURNAMENT

David Brunk (Northeast-10 Conference): I would like to move Proposal 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

This exemption creates an opportunity to promote men's and women's basketball in Division II. If adopted, this would allow two conferences to organize an event during the early part of the season in which the conferences would schedule men's and women's contests between a specified number of conference member institutions.

Such events may be scheduled between conferences within the same region with the intent of cultivating regional rivalries or they may be scheduled nationally in order to provide not only a competitive experience, but a travel and cultural experience as well.

Either way, the opportunity to promote Division II basketball and market Division II basketball are limitless. The Northeast-10 Conference and the New York Collegiate Athletic Conference urge your support of this proposal.

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I rise in opposition to this legislation.

I believe that this past year, with the change of countable games in the sport of basket-

ball for postseason tournaments, we've already added one additional game that people were not playing.

This is certainly something that could be done by respective conferences if they want to on their own, and count the games. They are simply asking to have this exempted. It will be an additional game that the teams will play. I think we play a significant number of basketball games at this time. I would urge your defeat of this legislation.

Barry Blizzard (West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I rise in support of this proposal.

With the concept of regionalization, I think this would give us an opportunity to increase competition within the region. It is permissible legislation. It would not have to be used. I think it would give us an opportunity to promote Division II men's and women's basketball within our regions in a very effective way. Thank you.

Eugene Hermitte (Johnson C. Smith University): We are concerned in the CIAA that this will take more time away from classes, that it will be an additional game and that there will be less focus on academics because of it. We speak in opposition.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 34 was defeated.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS – BASKETBALL – FIRST CONTEST

David Brunk (Northeast-10 Conference): I would like to move Proposal No. 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal establishes November 15 as the consistent start date for the first permissible contest in men's and women's basketball.

Current legislation establishes the first permissible contest date by counting back 136 days from the date of the Division I men's basketball championship game. Due to the decision to delay the Division I championship game by a week in future years, the start of the Division II basketball season has been delayed accordingly. This has caused hardships on many conferences in developing conference schedules, especially when the intervening holiday break is factored in.

By establishing November 15 as the first permissible contest date, the need to periodically calculate the first contest date for future years and continually update the Division II Manual will be eliminated. Further, the problem of having the Division II basketball season dictated by the scheduling of a Division I men's basketball championship game would be eliminated.

This proposal will further the deregulation effort by adding basketball to the list of Division II sports that have a consistent start date.

The Northeast-10 Conference, Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference and the New York Collegiate Athletic Conference urge your support of this proposal.

Kim Vinson (Cameron University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 35.

Current legislation requires tedious calculations to determine the date on which institutions may schedule their first day of competition in men's and women's basketball. In addition, inconsistent start dates are a result of the current method, which is dependent on the Division I championships. Having a consistent start date will allow conferences to set their schedules years in advance.

In order to facilitate Division II autonomy and deregulation, I urge your support of Proposal 35.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 35 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS – FIRST DATE OF COMPETITION – FALL SPORTS

Thomas Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move No. 37.
[The motion was seconded.]

Our intent in putting this proposal forward was that in the sports of cross country, field hockey, football, soccer and women's volleyball, to specify that an institution shall not engage in its first date of competition before the Thursday preceding September 1. That would replace what we have had, which was September 1, or the Thursday preceding Labor Day. We felt this would give us more continuity. We urge acceptance of this.

Suzanne Sanreget (Michigan Technology University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 37.

This proposal further advances the goals of simplifying and deregulating Bylaw 17. By scheduling the first date of competition by a day of the week, it will ensure a constant start date, rather than one that floats with the date of a holiday, thus bringing simplification to the application of the rule.

Further, the Division II goal of deregulation is to bring greater consistency to the application of the legislation. This proposal will permit consistent scheduling of nonconference and conference competition from year to year.

For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 37.

Joan McDermott (Metropolitan State College of Denver): On behalf of the Football Project Team and Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 37.

The first permissible start date for competition under the current legislation floats with and is dependent on the date of a holiday. This proposal will establish an actual day of the week as the first permissible start date for competition. Having a constant start date will permit institutions the flexibility to set their schedules in advance.

To bring greater consistency and simplification to Bylaw 17, I urge your support of this proposal.

Ms. Cormier: We're going to vote on Proposal No. 37 now, but Part C first. Again, this is only for those institutions and conferences supporting football. This is a paddle vote.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Part C of Proposal No. 37 was adopted.]

We will now vote on Proposal No. 37, Parts A, B, D and E.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Parts A, B, D and E of Proposal No. 37 were adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS – PERMISSIBLE DATES AND OUT-OF-SEASON ACTIVITIES – FALL SPORTS EXCEPTION, GOLF AND TENNIS

Michael Marcil (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended for the sports of golf and tennis. It permits an institution that counts golf or tennis as a fall sport and discontinues its championship activities by November 1, instead of the permissible November 15, to add 15 calendar days to the 45 consecutive-calendar-day-available segment period during the nonchampionship segment.

This does not add times for permissible athletic activity. Rather, it will serve institutions that are located in geographic areas that have very adverse weather during the spring. We urge your support for Proposal No. 38.

Michael Kovalchik (Hillsdale College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 38.

This proposal permits institutions that count golf or tennis as a fall sport and discontinue the championship segment activities by November 1 to add 15 calendar days to the period of 45 consecutive calendar days available during the championship segment.

This recognizes the institutions that are affected by Northern climates and offers an opportunity to have a wider window of opportunity in the nonchampionship segment to afford the maximum 24 days of activity as recommended. This proposal does not increase the number of days that golf and tennis nonchampionship activity is permitted during the spring season. It remains at 24 days. This simply broadens the time period in which the minimum of 24 days of nonchampionship activity may occur.

I strongly ask for your support.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Proposal No. 38 was adopted.]

RESOLUTION – FINANCIAL AID – MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS

Joel R. Smith (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): I move No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Division II philosophy statement outlines the division's emphasis on broad-based participation, equitable participation and competitive excellence.

With the deregulation of financial aid accomplished at the 2001 Convention and the financial challenges facing public and private institutions, it's time to review the history and rationale for current financial aid limits in all sports.

This resolution charges the Management Council to perform this task, report its findings and propose legislation to adjust, if necessary, financial aid in specific sports to better reflect the Division II membership and its philosophy.

On behalf of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference, I urge you to support this resolution.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): I now stand for what may appear on the surface to be opposition to what looks like good research. However, the sponsor of this resolution in its statement asks us for our support because in our difficult financial times it will help cut costs. However, I must suggest that each institution already has that rather elegant method available. They can hold their own lines.

The Management Council, if I am reading correctly, has already charged the Legislation Committee to do research on this very topic of Division II scholarship levels. This resolution also asks that the Management Council bring forth legislation for the members to consider at the 2004 Convention. By that very point, it suggests that whatever review comes forth must be designated toward cutting scholarship costs. Again, the members already have that elegant decision within their grasps.

From the perspective of this athletic director, it appears that this is clearly an effort to equalize competitive capabilities through legislative methods. With this in mind, I urge the membership to defeat this resolution. It asks for research answers with a specific end in mind. I urge the membership to support the Management Council and the Legislation Committee's review on this issue.

Specifically, some of the points that I think are important are how we may actually address gender-specific scholarship opportunities. Let's not muddy this research with a predisposed conclusion. Again, we already have the answer to fiscal issues amongst ourselves. It's called self-discipline. My president gives me that opportunity every single year.

Let the Management Council and the Legislation Committee forward their report, and then let's take action if needed. Thank you.

Steve Murray (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): We proposed the resolution before the Management Council's move to the Legislation Committee. But I believe that on Saturday evening the outgoing president of the Association mentioned that one of the strengths of the identity of Division II is a common bond; that we look for the whole, rather than the individual.

I hope that we will pass this resolution, to keep this issue at the forefront. It's not an attempt to necessarily change the rules that we have. It only initiates a review by the Management Council led by the Management Council and Presidents Council. A comprehensive review is certainly something that would be a benefit to the whole group in this room.

[SAAC Position: Support.]

[Resolution No. 39 was adopted.]

Ms. Cormier: We're going to have a window of reconsideration for Proposals 30 to 39. So please take a few minutes to do this. We'll then come back and do our open forum have a few remarks, and then you will be free to go to lunch.

I now ask if there's anyone who would like to ask for a reconsideration on Proposals 30 to 39. Is there anyone who would like to do that? Except for 36, excuse me.

John Meisel (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville): I voted on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 32. I would ask for a reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Cormier: Would you like to address the reasons why?

Mr. Meisel: No.

Ms. Cormier: No, he does not want to address the reasons why.

Jon Mark Hall (University of Southern Indiana): There wasn't much discussion on the evaluations side of Proposal No. 32. I just want to state my opposition as well as that of a lot of the colleagues who I was talking to.

I want to make clear that this would be the only time in any sport that we would track evaluations throughout the recruiting year. We've done some great work over the last couple of years with deregulation. Now we're going back a little bit and asking you to track the number of evaluations for the months of May and June only for women's basketball only. I believe everyone should think about that and their compliance coordinators, and what we've done over the last couple of years. I would ask to oppose Proposal 32.

Ms. Cormier: We have a clarification on this issue from our membership services representative.

Missy McCracken (NCAA Staff): That particular proposal in the intent statement is for clarification purposes only. In women's basketball, it's not really the number of evaluations, but the number of events. That may clear up some of the misunderstanding that you had in your discussion, at least what you're mentioning to us at the microphone.

Ms. Cormier: Do we have a comment? Is there anyone else who would like to speak to this? We are considering the motion to reconsider the proposal.

Mr. Hall: Just clarification. So that's saying we would not have to track those evaluations for May and June?

Ms. McCracken: It's just like you do it now in the events.

Ms. Cormier: We are voting on whether to reconsider Proposal No. 32. That's our first vote. It will be a paddle vote. All in favor please raise your paddles; all opposed please raise your paddles. The motion fails.

Are there any other proposals to be reconsidered?

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): I voted on the prevailing side on Proposal No. 34. I would like to make a motion to reconsider.

[The motion was seconded.]

There was additional information that should be provided. I'm going to allow the folks that wanted to do that a chance to do it.

David Brunk (Northeast-10 Conference): As a point of information, I want to stress the fact that this would be permissive and not necessarily the addition of contests for men's and women's basketball during the year.

Our intent as sponsor was to create a situation for institutions that are not involved with the Disney Tipoff to enable the promotion of Division II basketball. As you know, there are only approximately eight schools that do participate in the Disney. But if other schools want to strive for the regionalization and compete against other conferences, we would allow them the opportunity if they desire to do it. It doesn't mean that every other institution in Division II is going to be playing an additional game.

There are some conferences that are going to be utilizing the top four men's and top four women's teams to play. Others might have their top three or their top five. Again, we're just adding an option for the further promotion of basketball in Division II.

If you look at the figures, with the 27 contests, with the three exemptions after November 1, and prior to the first contest date, if you participate in an event such as Disney, you would be looking at 33 games, where even those that choose a conference challenge type concept would be looking at 31.

Again, it's up to each conference and institution whether they want to participate. Hopefully, that will help clarify the issue.

Valerie Sheley (Presbyterian College): I'm speaking against this proposal. It is asking for an exemption, which means an additional contest.

Currently, you are able to have these challenge matches. We have one with the Peach Belt Conference. It's just a countable competition. So this is an exemption. It's asking for an additional competition. Yes, it is your option if you use it. Thank you.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): I don't wish to beat a dead horse, but I am in agreement with opposing this reconsideration.

With this option, schools will add games. When I was at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, we started a Division I basketball tournament with the Special Exemptions Committee. In that time frame, their goal was to state that every school in the country get opportunities for additional games through exempted tournaments.

That is exactly what we're doing here. We have added a game. We don't need to add more. I stand in opposition.

Ron Pavan (Ohio Valley College): I would like to reconsider and add this. I am a regional rep for women's basketball. The strength of schedule in region is weighed very high. This would benefit each school in their conference to play in their region.

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): As an independent institution, we're obviously opposed to this. We already cannot participate, and we could not participate in this kind of an exception. This would result in most of the teams that we currently play having one more contest than we do. It would affect regional qualification. It would affect power points. It would affect all sorts of things that independent institutions currently do not have an option to participate in.

We would urge opposition to reconsideration.

Nathan Salant (Gulf Southern Conference): If the goal of this proposal is to encourage in-region competition, then the bottom line is, why aren't the schools within the region already playing each other? Very simple. We are in a geographic location where it's very difficult to get to our other in-region conferences.

This legislation is not going to affect the dollars and cents issue of travel from Arkansas to Miami and Tampa, Florida. What this legislation does is create an advantage for some conferences in some geographic locations. It further separates the different groups within Division II and is simply not a good proposal.

If you want to play in region, there are no conferences that play 27 conference-mandated league games. You can do it now. There is no need for extra contests. Thank you.

Carmine Calzonetti (New York Collegiate Athletic Conference): We're a sponsor of this legislation.

With Division II being called the division of opportunity and participation, I would like to once again for our delegates consider the fact that we're giving opportunity to our student-athletes. We are developing intercollegiate competition within region. It's something that you do not have to do, but if you are able to do it, I would strongly consider voting for this legislation.

Ms. Cormier: We are going to vote now on the reconsideration of Proposal No. 34. All in favor please raise your paddles; all opposed please raise your paddles. The motion for reconsideration fails.

Are there any other items to be reconsidered?

Since we have completed the formal business of Division II, this is an open forum now. I would like to open the floor to delegates for any general comments or questions.

Joan McDermott (Metropolitan State College of Denver): Whereas, the term of office on the NCAA Division II Management Council for Mike Marcil will expire at the conclusion of the 2003 Convention; and,

Whereas, Mike Marcil has made significant contributions to the Division II Management Council and NCAA Division II membership; and,

Whereas, Mike Marcil has served remarkably as Chair of the Management Council for the past year, and in that capacity has been an active member of the Administrative Committee, the Budget and Finance Committee, the Football Issues Project Team, the Membership Review Project Team, and Student-Athlete Involvement Project Team; and,

Whereas, Mike Marcil has been a wise and astute counselor to the Academic Requirements, Championships, Legislation, Membership, Nominating, Student-Athlete Reinstatement and Student-Athlete Advisory Committees; and,

Whereas, Mike Marcil has helped focus attention on the division's key attributes and helped develop resources to promote Division II's identity;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Division II membership recognizes Mike Marcil's leadership and vision in helping to guide NCAA Division II into the 21st century.

He will be greatly missed as a member of the Division II Management Council and as a leader for the NCAA. (Applause.)

Ms. Cormier: Thank you very much.

Kay Schallenkamp (Emporia State University): Before I begin my resolution, I would first like to express my appreciation to you, Patty, for an extremely, extraordinarily well-run business session. Thank you so very much. (Applause.)

Now for official business. I am a member of the Presidents Council.

Whereas, Patricia Cormier will conclude her two-year term as chair of the NCAA Division II Presidents Council at the conclusion of the 2003 Convention; and,

Whereas, Patricia Cormier has made significant contributions to the Division II Presidents Council, the Executive Committee, and the NCAA Division II Membership Committee; and,

Whereas, Patricia Cormier has served as chair of the Division II Presidents Council and in that capacity chaired the Administrative Committee, and a member of the NCAA Executive Committee, and has provided leadership and vision for the Division II membership, and has demonstrated her commitment to Division II student-athletes; and,

Whereas, Patricia Cormier has been instrumental in implementing the Division II strategic plan and establishing the division's long-range budget projections; and,

Whereas, Patricia Cormier has represented Division II on Association-wide matters,

including the hiring of the new NCAA president, and decisions regarding NCAA budget issues;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Division II membership wishes to express its deep appreciation to Patricia Cormier for her hard work, passion and dedication to the growth and success of Division II. Thank you. (Applause.)

Ms. Cormier: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Kay.

I just want to tell all of you that this has not been a labor that has been difficult. It has been a privilege to serve this body. All of you should be commended for the work that you do with student-athletes and student-athlete welfare. I hope that you will never let go of that particular focus. It's all about them. I thank you so much for allowing me the privilege of serving you.

Now I have some remarks that I must make before we send you off to lunch.

I also wanted to say to you that the Division II Management Council will conduct its post-Convention Management Council meeting at 3 this afternoon, so you don't have your work concluded yet.

I want to thank the NCAA photography for the Division II action pictures that we saw on the big screens today. I want to thank the delegates for your attention and to tell you that I think you really look at these issues very carefully. You are to be commended for doing so.

The Division II business session of the 2003 NCAA Convention is now considered closed. See you next year in Nashville, Tennessee.

[The business session was adjourned at 12:23 p.m.]

Division III Issues Forum

Sunday, January 12, 2003

The Division III Issues Forum was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Presidents Council Chair Bette Landman presiding.

Opening Remarks

Ms. Landman: Good afternoon. I want to welcome you to today's forum on the future of Division III. I'm Bette Landman, president of Arcadia University and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. Joining me on the dais is John McCardell. John is the president of Middlebury College and vice-chair of the Presidents Council. In addition to John, there is Chris Walker, faculty athletic representative at University of Redlands and chair of the Management Council; Susan Bassett, director of athletics at William Smith College, and Management Council vice-chair; Amy Ashbrock who represents Wilmington College from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and also serves on the Management Council; Dewayne Barnes from Whittier College, who also serves on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and the Management Council. Next to me is Dan Dutcher, Division III chief of staff. To my left is Kay Hawes, assistant director of The NCAA News, and Division III governance liaison.

The future of Division III is obviously a topic of significant interest and importance. During the next two hours, we will explore this issue in detail. We will hear feedback that the joint subcommittee has received so far and review a couple of models. Next, we'll have a chance to participate in round-table discussions regarding these issues and then to discuss and share your thoughts with the full group in open session. Finally, we will hear about the next steps.

I hope you've had an opportunity to review the latest issue of the Division III newsletter. If not, I believe there are additional ones around that you can recover. In there is the draft of where we are at present on this issue, keeping in mind that this is an evolving target and your input will be terribly important today in helping us to shape the next iteration.

As you recall at last year's Convention, the Presidents Council and Management Council established a joint subcommittee to focus on the future of the division. The Councils created the joint subcommittee to address many issues and concerns. Some of the concerns related to an apparent legislative conflict among the membership. This included issues such as playing and practice season, eligibility rules, red-shirting, etc.

Other concerns were expressed by external constituencies and suggested that Division III has lost the proper balance between athletics and academics. Some of these concerns were articulated in the book "The Game of Life." These issues start at the very heart of Division III philosophy and call into question the long-term status and direction of our division. So the governance structure established the joint subcommittee and charged it to first, examine the shared educational values of the division in light of Division III philosophy and, second, to explore options for legislative and organizational change, consistent with those shared values and philosophy.

The joint subcommittee first determined that it would focus on five specific areas: financial aid; eligibility and recruiting; playing and practice seasons; championships; and membership. These areas seem to be a comprehensive list of the key concerns that have been expressed. The joint subcommittee then established subgroups in each of these five areas as well as an oversight committee to coordinate all the activities. During the past year, the joint subcommittee and its subgroups have actively attempted to fulfill their charge.

The joint subcommittee and its subgroups held numerous meetings and conference calls. Each subgroup was asked to consider whether current legislation and the organization in that area reflects shared values and philosophies within Division III. The Division III philosophy has remained the touchstone throughout this process. The joint subcommittee also implemented, primarily through the Management Council, a significant outreach program to communicate with conferences and independent institutions, which you will hear more about in a minute. We have also provided opportunities in the past and will in the future for individuals who regularly attend certain kinds of professional meetings to have a forum in which these issues can be discussed.

Today, we will update you on the findings of the joint subcommittee at this point. We have received some preliminary feedback and we will attempt to share that with you. Most importantly, however, we want to hear from you. Today represents the first chance that you have had to discuss this topic together as a division. Over the next year, we will have many more opportunities for feedback regarding the future of our division. We plan a membership survey next month and focus group discussions in April. Any legislation that moves forward will be thoroughly discussed and debated in the months leading up to next year's Convention.

Nothing at this stage is written in stone. There's no preconceived direction. What we really want to do is take an honest look at who we are, what we say we believe in, and are we living up to those goals. After we've had feedback from all of the different constituencies, when we're sure that people understand the issue and can relate to it and get back to us, at that time legislation will be formatted. We will review these next steps in more detail later. For now, I encourage you to listen attentively and then take advantage of this unique opportunity to help shape the future of our division. Discussions are at a very preliminary level. Nothing has been decided, so we need and request your guidance and direction.

Chris Walker and Susan Bassett will now report on the current status of the joint committee's work.

Chris Walker (University of Redlands): Good afternoon. Let me ask those who are in the back standing to please come up front and occupy these tables. Leon Lunder and Connee Zotos are feeling very bad because there's very few people at their table, so make them feel better and come right up. We don't want any of you to have to stand.

As Bette indicated, the joint subcommittee and each subgroup met several times last year. During the first part of the year, we had several conference calls and also facilitated discussions at a few meetings like NAACDA and the Division III Commissioners Association. In particular, each of the five subgroups reviewed applicable portions of the philosophy statement and identified related legislative concepts for future discussion.

By the time the Management and Presidents Councils met last summer, a great deal of confusion existed regarding the origin, focus and goal of our discussions. For many, the future of the division was not even on the radar screen. For that reason, the joint subcommittee and governance structure undertook an unprecedented comprehensive membership communication program. We contacted conference offices, independent members and other constituent groups and asked to be included on their meeting agendas. Members of the Presidents and Management Councils committed to attend as many of these meetings as possible. This effort has proven to be very successful.

Through December 19, members of the joint subcommittee, Presidents Council or Management Council, or staff have attended 38 meetings to discuss this topic. This represents in-person contact with a significant cross section of the Division III membership. These meetings have included CEOs, faculty athletic representatives, student-athletes and athletic administrators. We estimate that the meetings included 300 administrators and at least 100 student-athletes. Our sincere thanks to all of you here today who helped make these visits possible. The time and attention you gave for this important topic have proved invaluable.

Most visits confirmed what we suspected. The membership as a whole wanted more information regarding the topic and more time to digest that information. We organized our presentations based on the five areas of focus. For each area, the subgroups had confirmed the applicable provisions in the philosophy statement and then identified topics for possible legislative or organizational changes.

During our visits, we presented these options and asked for feedback. We tried to be as inclusive as possible when discussing these options. For example, we included options that we suspected might not have widespread appeal or popularity in order to challenge individuals to think creatively and to emphasize that nothing has yet been decided. I'm going to say that again, because during the year, as chair of the Council, I get comments from time to time suggesting that there's some group or somehow this has been decided and we're just jumping through hoops. Nothing has yet been decided. That's why you are here today—to give us the feedback we need to know where to go. All of the options and the underlying philosophical tenets appear in the newsletter that you have and are also on your campuses. They're also on the NCAA Web site.

As you might expect, we received during these visits a wide range of responses. Also, it was clear that some individuals were considering these options for the very first time and had not had the opportunity to discuss them with other campus constituencies or discuss them with conference members. This would be especially true of CEOs. Generally, presidents appear to have engaged on this issue only to a limited extent. This simply has to change.

With those caveats, during the next few minutes I'd like to summarize the feedback we received in each of the five areas. I will not address every option but will attempt to give you a sense of the range of responses and the options that received the most significant feedback.

Let's start with financial aid. We presented two models. One, to maintain the status quo and give no consideration of athletics in award packaging. The second would permit preferential packaging—the consideration of athletics in granting of aid within a cap. There appears to be consensus in this area. Most people favored Option 1, retaining the status quo provided it is buttressed by an enhanced compliance effort, like the annual reporting and audit process that has been proposed. You will hear more about the status of that initiative tomorrow. There was very limited support to permit preferential packaging.

Another initiative favored was to reexamine and possibly eliminate the ability of schools to use athletic funds or endowments established prior to January 1, 1979, to meet the need of student-athletes.

Next, eligibility and recruiting. We presented a variety of options in this area and received a great deal of feedback on ways to revise this legislation. One area of consensus related to initial and continuing eligibility. There was virtually no support to establish NCAA initial or continuing academic eligibility legislation, like, for example, Proposition 48 or the satisfactory-progress rules found in Division I and II. Institutional and conference autonomy would continue to govern those areas.

As you know, our current eligibility clock is based on 10 semesters or 15 quarters and

limits student-athletes to four seasons of competition within that time frame. It is a semester/quarter clock and does not run if the student-athlete is not enrolled full-time. Likewise, we do not count participation and practice towards the four-season limit if the student-athlete does not engage in competition during that year. There was some interest in reducing the length of the eligibility clock or adopting a running clock to encourage timely degree completion and to give greater emphasis to the undergraduate experience. Most feedback, however, favored retaining the current 10-semester/15-quarter clock.

At the same time, there was significant interest in counting practice or competition as a season of competition in that sport. This certainly begs of redshirting discussions of prior Conventions. There was also significant interest in taking steps to strengthen the eligibility standards that apply during a student-athlete's final term—perhaps by establishing a minimum number of credit or hours a student must carry to be eligible, regardless of remaining degree requirements. There remains interest, especially among our student-athletes, in permitting graduate-student eligibility at a school other than your alma mater. But this interest did not appear to be widespread.

In recruiting, we discussed a range of options—from the status quo, which is fairly permissive, to a ban on off-campus recruiting. Three concepts generated the most interest. One was to retain the current rule limiting contacts until after the junior year but to further establish sport-specific recruiting dead periods, during which no recruiting activities may occur during the senior year. Such dead periods currently exist in other divisions. Another option was to preclude home recruiting visits and limit other off-campus recruiting to evaluation only. A third was to establish a principle that athletic recruiting must comply with established policies and procedures applicable to the admissions process.

Now, what about playing and practice seasons? Now there's one on which we can all easily agree. (Laughter.) We presented a variety of options in this category, from the more restrictive to the more permissive. It should surprise no one that we received again a wide variety of responses. First, there is interest in modifying the length of our playing season and our contest limits. We did not specifically present Proposals 41 and 41-1 because the joint subcommittee's focus has been on further options. But regardless of whether or not Proposals 41 or 41-1 are adopted, there appears to be interest in some kind of modification of the playing season and contest limits. In that regard, one option that received interest was to establish specific starting and ending dates that are all-inclusive—from preseason conditioning through the NCAA championship. At the same time, there was very limited interest in reducing or eliminating limitations, in deference to institutional autonomy. Most people favored the status quo over that approach. As far as the nontraditional segment goes, we heard support for a variety of approaches. Again, no surprise there.

In addition to the status quo, we heard support for these other approaches. Further limits to the nontraditional segment, such as fewer contests or permitting practice only. Another approach, eliminate elimination of the nontraditional segment but permitting limited individual skill instruction with coaches. Third approach, total elimination of the non-traditional segment.

At the suggestion of our student-athletes, we included an option to limit the hours per week a student-athlete can spend on athletically related activities. This rule exists in other divisions. It did not receive a great deal of support, however, during our visits.

On to championships. We presented five options for feedback in this important area. The first option would retain the status quo—one division playing for one national championship in each sport. There was significant support for retaining that approach. The next two models assumed some kind of membership subdivision. Model 2 would establish a terminal championship for each subdivision. Teams would not play outside of their subdivisions during a championship. There was significant support for that model, again assum-

ing subdivision. In the third model, playing preliminary rounds would be subdivision specific, but later round contests, such as the semifinals or finals, would cross subdivisions and play to one national champion. There was support for that model as well. Models 4 and 5 would be more far-reaching. Model 4 would establish four regional championships. Model 5 would eliminate the national championships program. There are supporters for each of these models, especially related to certain sports. But their numbers are more limited.

For any subdivision options, we assumed consistent team sport access ratios as well as the idea that all sports within the school's athletics program would need to be in the same subdivision.

Finally, membership. In the membership area, we addressed the following issues: sports sponsorship; coaching; travel and squad limits; and finally, subdivision. We asked if our sports sponsorship minimums of five sports for men and five sports for women should be reduced, remain the same or increased. There was very limited support for reducing the requirements. There was significant support for retaining the current requirements. There was also notable interest in increasing them. There were also comments concerning Division III institutions that offered individual sports using Division I or Division II rules. We heard a number of people question why Division III schools are permitted to sponsor sports in Division I. They feel this is inconsistent with the Division III philosophy and our shared values.

We presented an option to limit the number of permissible coaches per sport. That option received limited support. Likewise, an option to limit squad sizes and travel parties also received limited support.

Our discussions regarding subdivision generated much feedback. It's safe to say that while many in the membership do not favor subdivision, a significant portion of the membership is interested in exploring that option. However, many fundamental issues related to any potential subdivision must be resolved. For example, how would such a subdivision be created? How would it be defined? How would it be supported? How would subdivision affect existing or new conferences? How much would it cost and how would it be paid for? It quickly became obvious in our discussions that the answer to these issues will affect the popularity of any subdivision option.

We'll explore those issues a bit more in our next segment. Let me ask Susan Bassett to come up and discuss possible models for Division III membership. Susan.

Susan Bassett (William Smith College): Thanks, Chris. Good afternoon. As you've just heard, the joint subcommittee has received a wide variety of suggestions. There are few areas of consensus at this time. Again, this should come as no surprise. Rather, we should think of this as a reflection of certain realities. Our division is large, diverse and features a wide variety of institutional missions. Further, each of us as administrators holds a unique set of values that are reflected in how we structure and administer our athletics programs.

While we all share a common belief in the Division III philosophy, each school and administrator interprets and applies that philosophy in a unique way. How then might we proceed as a division? One approach is to identify and address these issues based upon the values we appear to share as a division. This approach would maintain the division as a whole and address any legislative reforms or changes in that manner.

The first step would be to identify reforms upon which a clear consensus of the membership agrees and enact those reforms. The second step would be to identify those reforms upon which a majority of the membership appears to agree. The membership would then consider those reforms and approve or reject them as a division. Proposals that do not appear to garner significant support would not be sponsored for a vote by the governance structure. Likewise, proposals that ultimately are adopted by the membership would apply to the entire membership.

Another approach is to permit schools to group together first, further based upon shared values within the overall framework of Division III. This approach would not represent the creation of an entirely new division. Division III would continue to exist and it would retain legislative provisions that are of a clear consensus our schools share, consistent with our core values and the philosophy statement, and apply them to all members in the division. This approach would, however, create the opportunity for a significant group of schools to adopt legislation consistent with their shared values in the areas that we have discussed.

For example, it appears, based on feedback from our visits, that a number of schools are interested in applying more restrictive values related to eligibility and recruiting, playing and practice seasons, and sports sponsorship requirements, and would like the opportunity to compete separately for national championships. Subdivision would permit those schools to do that. At the same time it would permit schools not interested in those initiatives to maintain the status quo.

One other point—and it's important—all discussions so far have recognized that the opportunity for institutional self-selection is a prerequisite to the creation of any subdivision. Schools would select a subdivision based on the legislative standards that best fit their values. Schools would not be assigned to a subdivision based on predetermined objective criteria.

Let's review examples of how these two approaches might work in practice. Again, I emphasize these are examples, they're possibilities, nothing is etched in stone. Let's review a model that would maintain the division as a whole. This is one division with limited reform. We would create common seasonal start dates, possibly eliminate competition in the nontraditional season and strengthen transfer contact rule. Also, we'd establish recruiting dead periods, tighten financial aid regulations in compliance and require greater academic load for eligibility during the final term.

Major reform under the one division model would include eliminating merit-based financial aid, eliminate redshirting, shorten the eligibility clock, eliminate off-campus recruiting, also increase sports sponsorship minimums, create common seasonal start dates and shorten the length of the playing seasons. We could also consider eliminating nontraditional seasons, minimize the number of weekday contests and decrease the number of allowable contests.

Under subdivision of Division III, with a modified status quo, we might look to loosen financial aid restrictions, increase access to championships, retain nontraditional practice and competitive opportunities, while also increasing the length of the preseason, retain a number of allowable contests, increase graduate student participation and retain current sports sponsorship requirements.

Under a subdivision model on the more restrictive side, we would eliminate merit-based financial aid, eliminate redshirting, shorten the eligibility clock, eliminate off-campus recruiting, strengthen transfer noncontact rules, limit the championships access and length, create common seasonal start dates, and shorten the length of the total practice seasons. Under the more restrictive model, we might eliminate nontraditional seasons; possibly look to reduce the number of weekday contests; decrease the number of allowable contests; and limit weekly student-athlete time demands. Also, we could consider increasing sports-sponsorship minimums, eliminate the multidivisional classification, limit coaching staff sizes and limit travel squads.

Please remember that these models are only concepts. Don't assume that the joint subcommittee intends to pursue any of the specific initiatives that we have listed. Your feedback today and in the next few months will help make that decision. Ultimately, any of these reforms would take a vote of the membership to be enacted.

Also, as Chris noted, we recognize that some fundamental questions remain unan-

swnered. For example, would a minimum number of schools be necessary to create the subdivision? What would the specifics of division criteria be? How much would it cost to create the subdivision? How would we fund that expense? Unfortunately, it would be premature to attempt to answer such questions today. But with your careful consideration and feedback over the next hour, we can make a good start in resolving them. Thank you.

Amy Ashbrock (Wilmington College): Good afternoon. During the next half hour, we would like you to discuss the future of the division with the other delegates seated at your table. Included at each table is a member of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, the Management Council or a Presidents Council member. Also at each table are a series of discussion questions related to the future of the division. There are seven questions altogether. The first two questions relate to the overall future of the division. The other five questions relate to five topics that the joint subcommittee focused on.

Dewayne Barnes (Whittier College): We would like each table to address at least one of the broad questions and then discuss at least two of the remaining questions. The governance structure representative of each table will facilitate these discussions. He or she will also take notes and identify any consensus you might reach. When the half hour ends, you will have an opportunity to present your thoughts to the full group. We also will collect the notes from each table and forward them to the joint subcommittee for review. We encourage you to be open minded, honest, civil and inclusive. (Laughter.) Please begin.

[Note: The delegates had round-table discussions.]

John McCardell (Middlebury College): Reluctant as we are to intrude upon the discussions, in order to stick with the time schedule, please wrap it up so that we can begin the next phase of the discussion.

A half hour passes very quickly when the subject is of such importance. But I know that all of us are and will be grateful to you for the work you've devoted to this discussion and for your participation in it. Would the sergeant at arms please clear the aisles?

We thank especially the members of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and the Management and Presidents Councils for serving as facilitators. We would now like to make sure that we can devote an accurate amount of time for you to share your thoughts with the full group. We have scheduled about 40 minutes for this, and it would come as a surprise if we didn't use every moment of that. As mentioned before, we have a court reporter to preserve comments for the record, so I would ask that you please identify yourself and your institution when your microphone number is called upon. After you have identified yourself, please indicate the specific topic you're addressing and whether you are representing the view of your table or your own view. This next portion of the meeting is not limited to reports from the table. This is a time for individuals to express themselves on any of these matters. The floor is open for discussion. I'll do the best I can, with the help of Dan, to identify speakers by microphone. If you do have a comment, come to one of the numbered posts where you'll find a microphone and your questions can then be posed or a comment can be made.

Jim Nelson (Suffolk University): I offer my own comments, not the comments of my table. Two things that we've heard from the dais was that nothing is cast in stone and, secondly, was that there was a group that looked for some change but the vast majority in the Management Council who went around to the various conferences felt that the status quo was what they heard.

I guess my thought is whether or not, by having this discussion, that we're providing some validity to subdivision when in fact it appears that the vast majority of those meetings felt that the status quo was not all that bad and that many of the issues could be addressed through our Convention and through the bylaws.

John McCardell: I would certainly invite my fellow panelists to respond to these com-

ments. It certainly is not the intent to give validation to any particular approach. We are sensitive to the fact that both the feedback that we've gotten thus far from the field as well as the responses that we're apt to get this afternoon may or may not turn out to be representative of the division as a whole. It would be premature to rule in or to rule out anything or to assume anything in particular.

Brad Coffey (Amherst College): I'm on the Division III SAAC, and I'd like to speak about subdivision. Subdivision is really about different philosophies from our schools. I would disagree that we have different philosophies in Division III. We value student input and student welfare equally. That's what's important in staying together. That's what should drive us at these meetings.

The problems that we have can be settled pretty much on a conference level and on a smaller basis. If schools are worried that they're not going to be able to compete nationally because they don't want to accept a dip as much for athletes or want to focus more on athletics, that's their choice. They should be able to do that. On a conference level, they should be able to compete against other schools on a small level. Would that be in that same ideal? I don't think it's a problem that schools want to do that. I just believe that we should be able to stick together and solve these problems. (Applause.)

Tom Hart (Webster University): I speak on behalf of myself, although I did share this at the table. Under the playing and practice seasons area, one of the things we talked about was primary emphasis on regional in-season competition and conference championships.

Tomorrow, we're going to vote on a proposition reducing the number of contests that are played in a number of sports, yet as a division we have exempted conference tournaments at the end of the season and let conferences continue to play postseason competition in an effort to gain an automatic qualifier. I urge the groups to consider that. It definitely impacts independents that have no opportunity for conference championship postseason tournaments. The retention of an equal playing field, if we were to look at that as a way to reduce the numbers, would also potentially impact the regular season, which now has to squeeze a week so that we can get conference tournaments in.

If we didn't allow that exemption, it would give us an opportunity to look at the overall schedule in an equitable fashion. Thank you.

John Schael (Washington University, Missouri): At our table, we talked about splitting Division III. The consensus was that we're really not supportive of that concept. We feel that most conferences can resolve all the issues that are associated with intercollegiate athletics at the Division III level. If a conference elects not to have a traditional season, they can do that. If they decide to have fewer games that are allowed, whether it be basketball, soccer, softball or baseball, they can do that. They have the option. Again, it would not be detrimental to their selection to an NCAA national championship, because you're going to have an automatic qualifier from that particular conference. We feel that there are a lot of institutional decisions that have to be made, and that conferences can resolve a lot of the issues in terms of Division III.

We also feel that it would be pretty difficult to have two divisions within Division III. Scheduling would become a major issue because III would not play against III-A because there are different philosophies that are in place on a particular campus. We don't think that national legislation can resolve all the issues that we have before us.

Also, in terms of the playing and practice seasons, I speak as an individual for Washington University. We met with our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We have about 32 members. They were very adamant in terms of their views on the nontraditional season, and playing and practice seasons, as well as playing dates. They don't want to see any change at all. They want to have the opportunity to compete and to participate, to interact with their coaches as well as their fellow teammates.

If we start making all these adjustments and watering down Division III athletics, what happens is you're going to lose a lot of quality students who select a Division III institution. Not only that, you're going to lose some of your quality coaches, because they want to be able to compete as well for both men's and women's athletics. Thank you.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I'm speaking on behalf of myself on this issue. I agree with some of what John said. I think subdivision is already accomplished. I think we're already subdivided into conferences and who we wish to play. At Emory, we develop our schedules around our conference and like institutions that we select to play, whether that's travel or whether that's inviting them to our tournaments.

In effect, I think we are already subdivided. We make choices of who we want on our schedules during the regular season and who we associate with during our conference. We control that. As John pointed out, you can control a lot of other factors. Off-campus recruiting, traditional or nontraditional seasons, when you start, when you stop. The issue really is advancement to championships. I think a lot of people control their own destiny already in conferences in selecting their opponents. The big issue that drives that is trying to level the field for championships. I don't know that we'll ever be able to do that. We have a fairly good swimming program. Kenyon has a better program. Whether the season is 21 weeks long, 19 weeks long, or three weeks long, I like Kenyon's men's chances in swimming. (Laughter.)

Eric Wood (NCAA Staff): I'm the governance intern presenting some of the thoughts of this group of experts in Group 16. I'm going to provide just a few highlights of the conversation. Some of the members feel that while they're receiving the message that you want feedback, it seems that the subdivision idea is presented and it's the only way to go. Someone presented that the forum is a wonderful concept, but the message of subdivision is limiting the discussion. The question was raised that it is very different. Can there be some kind of common ground? Is there some common ground to be found? There was also concern about where this push is coming from. If everything is great, where is this inquiry? The demographics have changed since the Division III philosophy was created. With that is a residual effect of the arms race. Some feel that in Division III's view, there's an envious view of Division I and II. And that would be it. (Laughter.) Thank you.

Barb Bolich (Dominican University, Illinois): At our table, we started off our discussion but quickly took pause to make sure that we all identify the reasons why we're discussing subdivision before we go too far down the path of conversation. What are the issues? Is it playing and practice opportunities? Is it access to championships? Is it financial aid related? If those are the reasons why, shouldn't we discuss those separately and not use subdivision as a solution to those different sorts of problems? In Division III, we are bound by a strong philosophy and a strong mission statement. Let's be sure that we value that and move from there before we use subdivision as a solution.

Joyce Wong (Eastern Connecticut State University): The interesting comment from our table, which I think has a lot of merit, is the fundamental question we should be seeking instead of answers to all these areas. What is it that we are trying to do?

Walter Johnson (North Central College): I probably am just simply going to echo a lot of what I've already heard. At our table, to try to bring our thoughts to one succinct comment, the idea was simply this: Before we take much more time discussing the idea of subdividing, I think it's important that we spend a little more time ridding ourselves of those issues that would divide us and not necessarily thinking of ways to rid ourselves of each other. (Applause.)

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I'm the executive director of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I want to put my conference members at ease. I'm not speaking for the conference, nor am I speaking for the table. I wish we

would concentrate a little more on the future of Division III and not really put that carrot out there about subdivision. We have some issues. We all know we're a very large division, up over 400 members now. That may be an unmanageable number at some point.

How many presidents are in the room, by a show of hands? I want to thank those presidents for attending, but as long as the majority of our presidents are disengaged from this process, we're heading down a road without an answer.

Bob Malekoff (College of Wooster): I'm speaking for at least some of the members of my table. The Division III philosophy statement specifies that national championships should not be the primary emphasis in Division III. The reality is that there is significant emphasis on championships and this should be more openly acknowledged.

(Applause.)

Dave Masilunas (Pennsylvania State University Erie, the Behrend College): I am a representative from the AMCC, and I'm one of the new guys on the SAAC this year. At Table 28, we had a wide representation of schools, such as people from New York, myself from Pennsylvania, Illinois, Minnesota and California. We had probably one of the most lively conversations in the area. The main topic was to stay as one division, find common problematic areas—such as redshirting and such as financial aid—and address them with legislation. We don't want the NCAA to micromanage us and penalize those schools that want to make a commitment to athletics on respective campuses. There are without a doubt huge differences amongst Division III schools. That, however, is what makes us unique and special. That is why it's the most important reason for us to all stay together.

Dennis Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): Our table had a good discussion. We had a good, diverse group of various institutions and conferences. We talked about differences of opinion. We felt that what's causing this in Division III may be the fact that there are two or three different philosophies in Division III. This may be evidenced by the great number of sports sponsored throughout the division and the commitment to broad-based programs, which really we've established a number of 10. But in Division III, we range from at least a minimum of 10 to sometimes over 30 sports sponsored.

To not recognize there are inherent differences among the 410 active members is unrealistic. We are a large and very different group recently. I think the difficulties we've had with our legislative process and trying to get things passed as a unit, a group that you would think would have a little more accommodation, it's been very difficult over the last four or five years.

Regarding membership, that's one of the categories we took. Our table was supportive of possibly increased sports sponsorship as a requirement, provided it is in a subdivision setting so as not to disadvantage those who would rather not ask for it to stay where they were. We were opposed to coaching staff and travel squad limits. Thank you.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): We had an interesting discussion relative to seasonal expansion and what's going on. The bottom line is we are all driven by desire for success. But success is a sliding scale; it's a moving target. Initially, you may be trying to be competitive in contests. When you become competitive in contests, then you want to win your conference. Once you've won your conference, you want to dominate your conference. Once you've dominated that, then you want to get into the national scene and you want to be able to have success in your rounds of the nationals and eventually you want to win it. Everything begins to expand as a result.

It becomes important to have nontraditional seasons. It becomes important to focus on one sport in your recruitment. It becomes important to start recruiting against Division I and Division II schools to get the athletes, because better athletes will help you become more competitive and be able to win the national title. So it's that striving for success that is always going to be there. That's one of the reasons we're in competitive athletics. The prob-

lem is always going to be that your people are moving forward in that direction. Not that that's necessarily a problem. But I think that we have to keep in mind that drive to reach the top is something that's always going to be there. The resources, whether it be staffing resources or financial resources or whatever, somebody is always going to win.

Deep in my heart, I personally am opposed to subdivision. I don't think it will solve all the problems. If we subdivide, somebody's still going to want to win the subdivision. They're going to start stretching the limits in that subdivision. I think those are things that are going to happen. The problem is that we all want to be successful. We have different definitions of success. As we move, our definition of success will change. There's going to be a point at which it causes a division between us, but it may not cause a subdivision within us.

Dan Calandro (Knox College): I'm definitely speaking for myself. I'm definitely not speaking for this table where I just sat, Table No. 23. I may not be speaking for very many people in this room based on what I've heard so far up here. In fact, I think there are some who think differently than what most people have said in the last 20 to 30 minutes, but not very many. That's okay, because we've probably spent too much time on this already.

I think we have gotten along the path of if it's good or bad or right or wrong to do something different in the future. I would like to remind us that I think those who might think we might do something different in the future, it's not making a judgment that those who want to do something different or don't want to do it are right or wrong. The Division III philosophy, which was established in the early 1970s, I think there are some who wish to preserve that and keep that. There are some who may want to keep changing that. Expanding seasons. Having more nontraditional seasons. That's fine. They're not bad people.

But there are some who I think would like to pull back and encourage more multi student-athletes who play more than one sport, who don't want to bid on athletes as much as maybe others are starting to. The numbers may not be very big. But I think there are some who do. Those who do, should look at those who want to do something more aggressive. They're not bad. I'm not making that judgment. I hope they won't as well. I hope folks will just keep the open mind that maybe there are still some who want to do something different. Those who might want to preserve Division III. The bidding wars on the student-athletes, the longer seasons, the nontraditional seasons, the urge to win national championships, those are all issues that for the most part we all have opinions on.

My table was overwhelmingly in favor of "what's the crisis?" There may not be a crisis. But I think there are still some out here who are saying, I don't want to change, I don't want to move forward, I want to keep what Division III was when it was founded. There may not be many. Someone will probably have to determine that number very soon so we can either move on or keep talking about this issue.

Tony Ladd (Wheaton College, Illinois): I would like to speak on behalf of myself but also address the future of sport as well as the future of this division. I think one of the critical elements that impinges upon us as administrators or presidents, those of us who are involved in the athletic enterprise, are faced with a culture which has changed dramatically from that which I grew up in as a kid. My hope would be that this division could remain one division because I think in this society, if we are to have an impact, if we are to have a voice, there needs to be a critical mass to help convey that message.

I urge us as a body to try to resolve those differences that can be resolved, some of which may never be resolved. We as one entity should speak very clearly to a culture that needs to hear about character development and fair play in the sport.

Jeff Dense (Eastern Oregon University): I speak not today for my table but as a political scientist to see democracy at work here. I don't know how many opportunities we get to talk with people outside of our conference, but I'm a big believer in a model of democracy

that's predicated upon conversing with your fellow citizens before any kind of decision is made. My focus is more on the process, not so much the outcomes. While we hear discussion of surveys and the likelihood of one, I caution the Management Council and Presidents Council to feel, under any kind of pressure, to have to come forth with proposals in terms of next year's meeting, given the heavy consequence of our actions, perhaps to look at these in the long term and maybe two years in advance of coming forth with proposals rather than feeling forced to come forth with proposals in a shorter time frame.

Jami Goldman (California State University, Hayward): Let us not forget the reason we're all here and that's for student-athletes. Student-athletes come to these institutions simply because they want to play their sport. Let's not take that away from them, let's put it that way. Granted, there are championships out there. But I think when you get down to it, they're playing because they want to play the game. It's the bottom line. (Applause.)

Michael Mooney (Lewis and Clark College): What the young woman just stated I think is a very interesting idea and I also think that it's wrong. Yes, we're here for the student-athlete, beyond a doubt. But we're here because we believe as institutions in a certain philosophy, a certain approach to athletics within the context of a whole. We wouldn't be here as a separate division were it not for the fact that our predecessors of the 1970s believed that not all was right in Division I. It is in a sense an anti-Division I philosophy. It's a philosophy that says athletics has a necessary but distinct and limited role within the entire educational experience; that what we do should be governed by other boundaries that go over and above that.

I asked my table—and I speak only for myself—whether there were, as laid out here before us today, certain wedge issues, that if decided one way would force some of the membership either into a separate division or out of the NCAA entirely. We weren't entirely certain that there were such issues, although we felt there may be. But I believe we thought, as apparently many of the members did when they were queried by the joint committee, work I applaud, that financial aid is such an issue. That is where we could give up the notion that we are to admit students without knowing whether that student is an athlete or not—in other words we are to treat athletes from the standpoint of financial aid in exactly the same way as our other students. If we were to give up that philosophy, we would probably divide this division and perhaps force certain members out.

If you truly found overwhelming support for the status quo on financial aid, I would urge you to put that issue aside. Because if there is any chance of our remaining together, we must deal with that issue and move beyond it. Because without that groundwork of everything else that we build on, we don't stand a chance, I believe, to remain a single division.

Bill Gehling (Tufts University): I was at Table 21. We couldn't even agree on the answer to Question 1. It was a fascinating discussion. First of all, we had a long discussion as to which question we should try to answer. (Laughter.) We agreed to tackle one and then we couldn't answer one. So we failed miserably and were unable to go on to the second page.

However, I would say that the diversity at our table pointed to me one of the great strengths of Division III, which is the diversity that exists among us. I think we can agree to some basic principles and some basic philosophy. But I personally love the diversity that exists among us on many of these other issues. I think the place to find greater unanimity on some of these topics is the conference, which is what was expressed from the student-athlete. Suzanne Coffey's son I thought said it as well as anybody. I think at the conference level, we can agree if we want to have some more strict rules that we're going to follow or more lenient rules -- well, we can't have more lenient rules. I guess I favor maintaining this division as it exists and then focus on the conference level on trying to resolve some of these things that divide us.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): I guess to expand just a little bit on the comments that

were made before about the perspective of athletics or place of it. Many of us serve in multiple capacities. I happen to be the chair of physical education, athletics and recreation within our institution. So my responsibility extends beyond the 535 athletes who participate to the 1,900 students that we have who are paying the same tuition, who want access to the same facilities and want comparable assets expended on their experiences, which are just as important to them.

I think that's one of the things within Division III. We have believed that we should not treat student-athletes differently than we treat other students. We do it to a certain extent because of the resources that are spent. As we continue to expand seasons, we not only are expending resources, but we are also taking away access to limited facilities for our general student body so that varsity athletes can dominate those facilities. One of the reasons to think in terms of some restriction. I know everybody says if you take anything away, I'm against it.

Well, we are taking things away. We have been taking them away since Division III was formulated. We have been taking away time from our general student population's access to facilities by expanding the number of contests and the length of season. We're taking away opportunities because we have to hire more staff because coaches can't coach multiple sports anymore. I don't care if a student-athlete wants to be a multiple-sport athlete or not, but I'd like him to be a student at some point involved in intramural activities and in other experiences on campus.

I think we have to be careful of taking something away that may be the right thing so that we are balancing the use of our facilities, the use of our staffing, the use of our resources. If we don't show that we're willing to do that, the top down will eventually show us that. Because the resources are not unlimited. We're in some pretty tough economic times. We need to show that we're concerned about those issues as well.

Mr. McCardell: Thank you all for your very valuable comments.

I would note several things in conclusion. The first thing is that if a profound or perhaps even not so profound thought is just now occurring to you, you haven't missed the opportunity of a lifetime to express it. The discussions are simply entering a new phase. This hardly marks the end. Feel free to share that thought with any of us or with members of the committee. Forward your thoughts at any time. Do keep in mind as well that we are going to be collecting the notes from all the tables so that a record of your conversations can be preserved.

Now, a word or two about next steps. In about a month we will be sending out a survey to the membership to obtain both formal and more comprehensive reaction regarding the future of the division. We will use both the comments and the discussions from today's session to help craft that instrument. We intend to distribute the survey to each president, to each athletic director, faculty rep, senior woman administrator, voting conference commissioner and Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We need to cast a very wide net in soliciting those views.

Our intent is to get different constituent group responses but especially encourage and hope that this conversation today and these conversations this weekend will provoke dialogue within your own institution prior to your completion of the survey. Where possible, and we hope that would be frequently, we'd also like full engagement of your president. We'll make a special effort to receive responses from CEOs to be sure that in the end they assume what is the appropriate role, which is the leadership role, in these important discussions. The Presidents Council at its meeting this morning established a communications plan to carry this task forward.

After that, in April, we'll convene two or three focus groups, including members from the various constituencies, to review the results of the survey and to discuss related legislative

or organizational proposals. Both the Management and the Presidents Councils will review all of this information at their first meeting in April and subsequently in their meeting in August. Our goal will be to sponsor any relevant legislation prior to the governance structure's September 1 legislative deadline for next year's Convention. What form and what shape that will take, if any, remains to be determined. It probably cannot be said too many times, though many of you may be thinking it already has been, that whatever form that may take will be the best effort of those respective councils to reflect our collective judgment on the state of the division and its future based upon the consultations that already occurred and will continue to occur over the next several months.

As many of you also probably know, some time probably in the late summer, early fall, about the time school is starting, we anticipate the publication of a follow-up book to "The Game of Life" under the authorship of Bill Bowen of the Mellon Foundation. While that is entirely an external exercise, it will, whether we would prefer it did or not, bring external scrutiny to bear upon the work of the division, the philosophy of the division and the future of the division. I think it is probably enough simply to note the fact that what will be appearing along about the time these discussions are moving us to whatever the next phase may be. That study will likely receive significant attention, especially among presidents.

Next year at this time, we believe that delegates will have the opportunity to consider proposals of some sort related to the future of Division III. It's likely, however, in fact probable, that the legislation will have a delayed effective date in order to give schools and conferences time to prepare for the implementation of whatever it is that may be decided. There will be other activities ongoing, of course. But those are the highlights, those are the milestones that is the root by which we expect to get from here—which seems reasonably clear at this point—to there, which is very difficult to define precisely.

If I might close with a brief personal comment.

As I assume these duties in the coming year, I look forward very much to engaging the membership of the division, particularly but not only the presidents, in these discussions. As an historian, I'm mindful of the experience of General Braddock. Some of you may know very little about General Braddock. He was sent over by the British in the seven years of war to try to get the British effort back on track. He was a supercilious general. He was a military expert. He believed he had all the answers. All he needed was the opportunity to impose them—first on his army and then on the enemy. If you know that much of the story, you know the rest of it. He led his forces marching smartly in lock step into the wilderness where they were ambushed and forced into a pell-mell retreat. General Braddock in the course of that unfortunate adventure was fatally wounded.

As his colleagues were transporting his body from the battle field and removing the arrows from his mortally wounded body, he reportedly uttered as his last words a statement that ought very much to be on the minds of all of us as we think about where this exercise is taking us lest we suffer a similar experience. He said: "We shall know better how to deal with them next time." Let us hope, and it is my fervent hope, that we shall know better how to deal with all of these things this time. I know I speak for all of my colleagues on the Presidents and Management Councils in saying that that is certainly how we intend to approach our work in the coming year.

I'd like to thank all of you again for your attendance and for your participation this afternoon. You have helped make this forum a very productive exercise and a great success. There being no further business, we stand adjourned. Thank you.

[The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.]

Division III Business Session

Monday, January 13, 2003

The Division III business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Presidents Council Chair Bette Landman presiding.

Opening Remarks

Ms. Landman: Good morning. Welcome to today's Division III business session. I am Bette Landman, president of Arcadia University and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. I will chair today's Division III business session.

Joining me on the dais this morning are Chris Walker, professor of communicative disorders and faculty athletics representative at University of Redlands, who chairs the Division III Management Council; Georgana Taggart, coordinator of paralegal studies and faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount St. Joseph, who will serve as our parliamentarian; Dan Dutcher, who serves as Division III chief of staff; Bridget Belgiovine, who serves as Division III associate chief of staff; Kay Hawes, who is an assistant editor for The NCAA News and also supports the Division III governance structure; Mweni Ekpo, who is an assistant director of membership services at the national office and is our Division III legislative liaison; and Brad Hostetter, who is an associate director of membership services. Mweni and Brad will serve as our interpretive experts during our discussion of proposed legislation later today.

Muriel Howard, president of the State University College at Buffalo; and Les Poolman, director of athletics at Dickinson College, also join us on the dais. Muriel and Les will present the reports of the Presidents and Management Councils, respectively, in just a few minutes.

Finally, joining us as a court reporter is Annisa Justice. She is a former NCAA staff member and she will help create an accurate record of our meeting.

Our first order of business is to adopt the Convention Notice and Convention Program. The Convention Notice is the aqua-colored booklet you received in November. The Convention Program is the booklet that you received at registration. Before I ask for a motion to accept the Notice and Program, I would like to point out that Pages 4 through 6 of the Program describe various corrections and editorial revisions to the Notice. None of these are controversial in nature. However, we will also try to remind you of these corrections when we address the specific proposals.

If we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order they appear in the publications. So if you wish to move to reorder a proposal, you'll shortly have a chance to do so. Let me go over some of the other aspects of this vote before we do that. Please note that by adopting the Notice and Program, you also are adopting all of the appendixes found in the Convention Notice. This includes three legislative appendixes that I want to share with you at the moment. One is the chart in Appendix B

that illustrates the application of Proposal Nos. 41 and 41-1. That's the playing and practice seasons legislation. We will discuss those proposals in more detail later this morning and this afternoon. Second is the grouping of noncontroversial amendments in Appendix F. The third legislative grouping is Appendix H and includes the modifications of wording based on intent. The amendments in Appendix F have been approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council and published in The NCAA News. We will not discuss any of them individually unless you move to do so at this time.

I will now ask for a motion from the floor to adopt the Notice and Program for the Division III business sessions so that we may proceed with our work.

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): On behalf of the members of the University Athletic Association, I move to reorder Proposal 43 before Proposal 42, with the provision that at the conclusion of the championship discussion later this morning, a subsequent motion will be made to rescind this motion to reorder.

[The motion was seconded.]

This afternoon, we'll have before us two well-developed proposals regarding the expansion of championship field sizes—Proposals 42 and 43. Later this morning, we will receive a report from the Championships Committee providing information on both proposals. After that report, we will have the opportunity to discuss both proposals. We believe that Proposals 42 and 43 are both good proposals. The adoption of either will greatly improve access to the Division III championship experience for our student-athletes.

But these two mutually exclusive proposals do present something of a legislative conundrum. By the rules of parliamentary procedure, we're not permitted to discuss the proposals head-to-head during the legislative session. Likewise, we cannot conduct a direct vote of one proposal against the other. Because the adoption of either proposal will render the other proposal moot, the sponsors of both proposals, as well as many in the membership, feel that whichever proposal is voted upon first will have an inherent advantage in the voting. The adoption of this motion to reorder the two proposals, with a subsequent motion to rescind that reordering, would give the advantage to the membership rather than to either proposal. What this motion does is ensure that at the end of the discussion session this morning, the membership will have the opportunity to decide by simple majority vote which proposal is considered first during the legislative session.

We offer this motion to reorder and a notice of our intent to offer a subsequent motion to rescind that reordering in good faith. This is not a parliamentary ploy nor are we seeking to preempt the discussion scheduled for later this morning. Quite the opposite. We offer this motion in this manner because it is the only way under parliamentary procedure where the final order of these two proposals can be determined by a simple majority vote of the membership after the discussion scheduled for later this morning and in a manner where this motion and the subsequent motion are debatable by the membership. Thank you for your patience, and I ask your support for this motion.

Ms. Landman: Thank you. Are there other areas of discussion?

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): I rise on behalf of the Management Council. I urge the membership to defeat the motion to reorder Proposals 42 and 43. We, the membership, asked the governance structure a year ago to create a proposal that would equitably expand championships access. The Championships Committee has responded with a proposal that broadens access in a consistent manner across Pools A, B and C.

As you know from the Convention Program and from Dick's remarks, there will be a presentation detailing the differences between Proposals 42 and 43 later this morning. It would be premature to reorder these proposals without benefit of very good information that will be presented in the next several hours. If you find that you still wish to place Proposal 43 ahead of 42 at that time, and after you've listened to all of those differences, then you

will have the opportunity to vote to reorder them at the start of the voting session this afternoon. Reordering these proposals now limits your opportunity to benefit from that presentation.

I urge my colleagues to exercise patience in waiting until this afternoon to decide which proposals to consider first by defeating this motion to reorder 42 and 43.

Richard Berman (Manhattanville College): I, too, urge you to stay with the current order for two or three reasons. Number one is you asked your governance, our NCAA structure, to consider the expansion of opportunities in championship play. This went through the Championships Committee, through the Management Council, and through the Presidents Council. Therefore, in terms of process, this is the way the agenda was set and this should have the priority for the first review.

The second is on the merits of the proposal, which you'll hear more about. This is the purest increase of opportunities in championships, and it respects the existing allocation between Pools A, B and C without shifting any advantage to any particular group.

Thirdly, in terms of merit and process, there will be more opportunities to vote either at the beginning of the afternoon to change the order, or if the membership feels strongly that, 43 is better then they can vote down 42 and vote for 43. But in deference to our structure, I ask you to support the existing agenda.

Tony Ladd (Wheaton College [Illinois]): I rise to commend the Management Council and the Championships Committee for their very hard work in responding to Proposition 48 last year, which was proposed by the CCIW and other schools. Because of that, I rise also to ask that we defeat this proposal to reorder so that we can follow through in relationship to what was recommended in Proposition 48. This was a very good resolution. The Management Council, the Presidents Council and the Championships Committee followed the guidelines and with that guidance has presented some very solid legislation. I would ask to keep the order. Thank you.

Mr. Rasmussen: While it is true that at the conclusion of the legislative session we can offer a motion to reorder, motions that would occur at that time would require a two-thirds majority to pass rather than a simple majority. Those motions would not be debatable by the rules of parliamentary procedure. By adopting this proposal now to reorder, with the provision that regardless of how the discussion goes this morning, the motion to rescind will be offered, and at that time the membership, based on what they hear in the discussion, can determine which proposal goes first and do it by simple majority vote so that the will of the majority is what will be followed this afternoon during the legislative session. It seems to me that is the most fair and equitable way to approach this difficult situation with both proposals. Thank you.

Erika Proko (Washington and Lee University): I oppose the reordering of 42 and 43 as well. I want to discuss a discovery regarding Proposal 43 and championship access.

First, I think it is well known that Proposal 42 is an equity model in which every sport is given a 1:6.5 access ratio. Forty-three, on the other hand, begins with a 1:8 access ratio and then changes with the number of automatic-qualifying conferences. Therefore, for each sport, the access ratio is not the same. In the charts and literature regarding Proposal 43, the access ratios are not broken down by each automatic-qualifying sport.

After calculating these numbers, a major problem was found. For seven of the 14 sports, the model is currently equivalent to that under Proposal 42, with a 1:6.5 access ratio for each sport. Four of the sports receive more access and only one of these sports is a women's sport. They are women's basketball, men's basketball, baseball and men's soccer. Three sports under the Proposal 43 model lose access, and all of these sports are women's sports, including women's softball, women's field hockey and women's lacrosse. In the instances of women's field hockey and women's lacrosse, the access is reduced to an astounding 1:7.2 access ratio instead of the 1:6.5.

Lorna Strauss (University of Chicago): This is out of order. This is a discussion of one or the other of the proposals. It is not a discussion of the motion that is on the floor.

Ms. Landman: Let us refer to our parliamentarian.

We have a ruling that this is not out of order. We might, however, want you to limit this because you will have an opportunity later on to make these points. So if you will focus now on the merits of the motion for the rest of your remarks, that would be helpful. That is the motion to either reorder or not reorder.

Ms. Proko: For these reasons, as a female student-athlete and as a person who believes in equality, I find the gender discrepancy of 43 disturbing, since 38 percent of women's sports are disadvantaged and not a single men's sport is disadvantaged.

Ms. Landman: Since 42 and 43 are roll-call votes, a motion to reorder also needs to be a roll-call vote. I need you to bring out your roll-call units.

Would you please cast your vote? The polls are now closed. The motion to reorder has been defeated.

We go back now to a simple paddle vote. The vote on the floor now is to adopt the printed notice and program for the Division III business session. All those in favor, would you raise your paddles? All those opposed, please raise your paddles. All those abstaining, please raise your paddles. The program is adopted.

Permit me now to review today's agenda and timetable. We have a very full day in front of us. Our job between now and 5 p.m. is to complete the Division III agenda identified on Page 14 of the Convention Program. The Convention Program identifies the specific discussion and legislative topics we will be covering this morning. There is an addition to the schedule I want to inform you about. Our new NCAA president, Myles Brand, has requested a few minutes of our time to address you this morning. We believe he will join us before our morning break. I'm really delighted that he has asked for this chance to address the division and the delegates. We will accommodate his busy schedule and stop when he's available to be with us. In his first 13 days, he has already made overtures to Divisions II and III in ways that I think are very promising, that we will be an essential and critical part of the NCAA going forward.

We do have a full agenda, especially this morning, and we will need to stay on schedule. What I would like to do now is a tradition. I'll try to keep it brief, but I do feel passionately that the presidential chair, as he or she is leaving his or her office, needs to share a few remarks about some of the things that I think are especially important to me personally and my perception of Division III and its future. I want to take a moment to share some of that with you. Please keep in mind this has nothing to do with the Presidents Council or the Management Council. It really has to do with my own perceptions. I want to take this time to share them with you.

First, we must realize that each and every one of us has chosen to compete at the Division III level. We chose this division for a reason. Our choice signaled that we had bought into a series of values and a philosophy that differentiated us from the other two divisions. Our belief in these principles has and should guide the legislation, rules and conditions of athletic play and should reflect the way we envision the role of athletics in the lives of our students and in the educational focus and values and mission of our institutions.

In many ways we see Division III guidelines as defining sport as it ought to be. I do think of ourselves as the noble division. We see ourselves as the keepers of the proper primacy of sportsmanship over winning at all costs, and as preservers of the focus on student academic success. At the same time—and I think last night at the Honors Dinner demonstrated this so clearly—we recognize that through athletics and other extracurricular activities, students have unique opportunities to build character and exercise principles of judgment and fair play. Division III claims to still believe in the old adage—and I grew up with this—it is not

whether you win or lose; it's how you play the game. Ced Dempsey referred to this as we in Division III tend to be the conscience of the NCAA. We are aware, however—and I think Ced pointed this out—that our noble purpose can be overlooked or even misrepresented in the current public disenchantment with the ethics and semiprofessionalism that they see characterizing big-time collegiate athletics. We, however, like to think of ourselves as the unsung heroes and heroines of the keeper of the flame.

In the last few years, however, in the debates that have accompanied key floor votes at the Convention for Division III and in such books as "The Game of Life," there are some who would claim that we, whether intentionally or incrementally, are on a course of action that is moving us inexorably closer to the very types of institutions and rules of play that we purport to reject. It is understandable that we appropriately are passionate about our fields. As you know, I'm not an AD. I'm an academic. I'm a college president now, but once an academic, always an academic. Those of us who come out of the academic area, we know very well that we would also want to extend our disciplines, because we don't want to let students leave our institutions without fully knowing our disciplines. Consequently, if we could go beyond 15 courses to 18 or 19 or 20, we would do so. But we buy into maintaining balance and we think there are certain kinds of information that every college graduate should have.

We also know that many students, in their focus on careers, say: "Please, I don't want to have to take those general education courses, those liberal arts courses. You're just cluttering up and you're wasting my money. After all, I'm going to become X, Y or Z. Why should I have to spend time and energy and dollars on something that I will never use?"

But as educators—and I firmly believe that every one of us, I don't care what role you play, when you're an AD, an FAR, a president, an SWA, if you're a student-athlete, all of us are engaged in the activity of education—we know that we must put our area of expertise in the context of what constitutes the most balance and beneficial program for students. In Division III, our work today and this coming year is to find that magic set of boundaries within which we can assure that students get the very best that we, all of us as educators, have to offer.

On the one hand, we may ask ourselves if, through a series of one-by-one votes, year after year, are we increasingly moving away from the Division III philosophy that caused us to choose this division for our institutional affiliation? Is it therefore time to review our direction and make mid-course corrections? On the other hand, we might decide that there are legitimate and recognizable differences in the way diverse institutions interpret compliance with our basic principles, and maybe we should recognize that honest difference through some form of reorganization of the division. Either decision is a momentous one for the division and deserves the honest and committed engagement of all key players at our institutions and in our conferences. By that I mean CEOs, SWAs, FARs, ADs, assistant/associate ADs, coaches, assistant/associate coaches, students—all of them. I don't think the dialogue should take place solely within your own group. I think it is incumbent upon us at our institutions and at the conference to get those diverse groups together and talk about the philosophy, the values, the mission of Division III and say where are we individually and collectively on these issues. That is what I am charging you with as your duty between now and our examination of this in more detail next year.

Thus, as we move through today's legislation and through this coming year's deliberation, comments and input, I ask that you keep uppermost in your mind adherence to the Division III philosophy and the realization that our individual and institutional commitment must be first and foremost to student academic success and ensuring that the student experience, that educational experience in which we all are engaged, is both balanced and broad. Thank you.

Now, we will continue with the business session by receiving reports from the Presidents Council and the Management Council. To present the report of the Presidents Council, I would like to recognize Muriel Howard, president of the State University College at Buffalo. She serves on the Financial Aid Audit Task Force, among a number of other Council assignments. Muriel.

Presidents Council Report

Muriel Howard (State University College at Buffalo): Thank you, Bette, and good morning, everyone. It is a pleasure to present this report, briefly summarizing the work of the Division III Presidents Council during 2002. In the fifth year of the federated structure, we directed increased attention to the future of Division III, with a specific mind to such key issues as communication with chief executive officers. We wish to thank the Management Council and the committee structure for advancing the goals and vision of the Division III strategic plan through their work.

In that regard, the Presidents Council and the Management Council meet together each year at the Convention. This year's agenda focused on the future of Division III. Also during the past year, the Council approved the 2002-2003 strategic plan and related budget. The three priority planning objectives continue to be: (1) student-athlete welfare; (2) diversity; and (3) membership education and communication. We are allocating significant Division III revenue to address those needs directly. The Council also approved a recommendation to allocate \$500,000 for championships contingency and \$200,000 for the future of Division III. I hope, as do all of my colleagues on the Presidents Council, that the membership will continue to access these new resources and thereby enhance the welfare of Division III. These resources are available through many Division III initiatives and programs. The Council was pleased with the sum of results from the first years of those programs. You will receive an update on specific initiatives in a few minutes, including testimonials from successful grant recipients.

In the area of communication, the Council continues to encourage dialogue related to the future of Division III. The Council has committed to a communications plan that we hope will further engage and involve our presidential colleagues on this issue. You heard about this topic during yesterday's forum.

To fill in many vacancies on the Council, we selected and welcomed Richard Berman, president of Manhattanville College; Carlos Hernandez, president of New Jersey City University; and Richard Wells, chancellor at the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh. We will soon welcome my SUNY colleague, Deborah Stanley, who is the president of the State University of New York College at Oswego and whose term begins at the close of the Convention. The Council elected John McCardell, president of Middlebury College, to serve as chair and Kevin LaGree, president of Simpson College, to serve as vice-chair.

Finally, I hope you will join me in wishing Bette the best in the new year and to thank her for her leadership and for her four-year term of service, which will conclude at the close of the Convention. Bette, you have served with distinction as chair for the past year. Your commitment to our division has been exemplary and your generous dedication of your time, your energy and talent has been greatly appreciated. Thank you all. That concludes my report. (Applause.)

Ms. Landman: Thank you, Muriel, and the rest of the members of the Presidents Council. It has been a privilege to serve you as chair during the past year. I do want you to join me in expressing our gratitude to our Presidents Council members for their service. (Applause.)

I'm going to digress. As you well know, with federation, Division I went to a represen-

tative system and Divisions II and III stayed with one institution, one vote. I think that's very important. But it only can exist when those of you who are in the audience volunteer to be part of the structure of the organization, not just presidents and Management Councils, but also the various committees. It really is a wonderful generosity that you give back to this organization.

To present the Management Council's report, I would like to recognize Les Poolman, director of athletics at Dickinson College. He has served on the Division III Amateurism Task Force and the Management Council's Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, among other assignments. Les.

Management Council Report

Les Poolman (Dickinson College): Thank you, President Landman, and good morning. On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I am pleased to provide a report of our work during 2002. It has been a year marked by significant discussion, dialogue and debate on key issues that resulted in legislative proposals that the membership will have an opportunity to vote on this afternoon. I would like to offer special thanks to the members of the Convention planning committee for their input on the format for the Convention. The Convention Planning Committee, Management and Presidents Councils will be eager to receive your feedback in our post-Convention questionnaire. The Council would also like to thank members of the Division III and Association-wide committee structures for their work during the past year. The work of these committees is highlighted in the quarterly Division III newsletter and The NCAA News and is also available on the NCAA Web site.

During the past year, the Management Council spent considerable time on issues related to championships, playing and practice seasons, the future of Division III, and the proposed financial aid audit process. The work of these committees will be reflected in our discussion sessions this morning and during our consideration of the legislative proposals and related amendments this afternoon. We also welcomed Sandra Slabik, faculty athletics representative at Neumann College, to the Council. The Management Council wishes to thank those individuals whose terms of service will conclude at the close of the Convention: Marcia Kierscht, president of Stephens College, who is also retiring; Amy Ashbrock, Wilmington College; and Dewayne Barnes, Whittier College, who are concluding their terms as representatives of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee; myself; and Christopher Walker, faculty athletics representative at the University of Redlands. I'd like to offer a special word of thanks to Chris as he concludes his term as chair of the Council. His time, commitment and dedication to our division has been outstanding. Chris, we know that you've made many personal and professional sacrifices over the past year in support of the division and for that we are grateful. The Council elected Susan Bassett, director of athletics, William Smith College, to serve as chair and Suzanne Coffey, director of athletics at Bates College, as vice-chair for the upcoming year. Good luck to you both.

As you heard yesterday and will hear today, the Management Council and Division III committee structure dealt with significant issues and priorities for Division III over the past year. We remain challenged by issues of our future and the discussions related to what lies ahead.

In concluding my report, I would like to make a brief personal comment. It's been an honor and a privilege to serve as a member of the Management Council during the last four years. I am impressed with and grateful to my colleagues and their body for their leadership, time and hard work throughout 2002. If there are no questions, that concludes my report. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Ms. Landman: Thank you, Les. One of the continuing strengths of the Division III gov-

ernance structure is the close working relationship that exists between the Presidents and Management Councils. Please join me in expressing gratitude to Les and the other departing Management Council members for their dedication and commitment to Division III over the past three years and especially to Chris, who has been really an extraordinary representative. As I told him, I believe he is the first faculty athletics representative to serve as chair of the Management Council. I told him that he had a very special burden, because if he didn't do the job well, we would never elect another FAR to such leadership. All of you who are FARs, you must know that he did such a wonderful job that we will probably be having some of you again. So again, let's join together and thank all of the departing members from the Management Council. (Applause.)

There are two other groups of individuals I would like to acknowledge. One group consists of those who serve in the NCAA governance structure. We are truly, as I have indicated, a membership organization and it is only through their hard work that the business of the NCAA can be accomplished. If you have served on any NCAA committee during the past year, please stand now to be recognized. (Applause.) I hope those of you who are seated had a chance to look around, because it is an extraordinary number of people who arose. They are very much the heart of what we are all about. Thank you again for your work on behalf of the NCAA and Division III. If you are interested in committee service, I encourage you to contact members of the Nominating Committee and staff. They can answer any questions you might have regarding committee vacancies and the committee nomination and selection process. You also can find helpful committee information on the NCAA's Web site. I would urge you as well to think about some of your colleagues whom you might want to nominate for some of these positions. It is very important that we have wide representation by various kinds of institutions, people of different gender, persons of color. If you know good potential members who would carry the work of the Association and Division III forward, please, either for your own nomination or for that of a colleague, we would like to hear from you.

The second group I would like to acknowledge are those who hosted NCAA championship competition during the past year. Championships do not take place without a great deal of hard work by many individuals at the host school. This hard work results in a quality championships experience for our student-athletes. If your school or conference office has hosted any round of an NCAA championship during the past year, would you please stand now and be recognized? (Applause.) You are all such shy people. You pop up and pop right back down before we even get a chance to finish the applause. I do want to thank you. I know it does take a great deal of work to do that. We are most grateful that you volunteer to do those kinds of activities. We are now ready to begin our morning discussion sessions and I would like to note two points before we begin.

First, again this year we have refrained from distributing handouts related to each discussion session. Each session will be presented in a Powerpoint format. The agenda and Powerpoint presentation for each discussion session are available on the NCAA Web site, ncaa.org. We have limited handouts for those who do not work well on the Web or have been developed late and are necessary to conduct our business. We're only handing out in paper form those things we didn't have a chance to get up on either the Powerpoint or the Web site.

Second, we will not distribute written reports from each Division III and Association-wide committee or hear from each committee chair. It is simply not possible to do this and accomplish all of our other business during one day. The quarterly Division III newsletter provides ample opportunity for the membership to follow the important work of each committee. Articles on important committee initiatives also appear regularly in The NCAA News. The Division III Web site includes agendas, supplements, minutes and rosters of all com-

mittees. I now invite the representatives participating in the Initiatives Task Force to join me on the dais. We will now proceed to the report of the Division III strategic plan and the Division III Initiatives Task Force. The Division III strategic initiatives are a significant component of our strategic plan. They represent Division III programs designed and implemented specifically to address Division III issues identified in the plan. We are in the third year of these initiatives and we are beginning to see very encouraging results. I believe you heard before, if you were at the business session, that Myles Brand indicated that Divisions III and II were many years in advance of Division I in working out a strategic plan. One of the outcomes of that were these initiatives. The wonderful thing about the initiatives is that they are very much ones that go back to your conferences and your institutions and you all have a chance to participate in some funding of these very critical programs.

To lead the report will be John Biddiscombe, director of athletics at Wesleyan University, who serves as chair of the Division III Initiatives Task Force. John.

Division III Initiatives Task Force Report

John Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Thank you, Bette. On behalf of the Division III Initiatives Task Force, I am very pleased to report to you on the continued progress that has been made over the past two years in providing significant resources for student-athlete welfare programs, increasing diversity, educating the membership and improving communication from the national office. I also have the pleasure today of introducing to you four speakers who have had firsthand experience in writing successful grant proposals and subsequently administering the resources provided by the task force.

Our first speaker, who is seated to my right, is Gary Karner. Gary is commissioner of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and will provide a testimonial about his conference's use of initiative funding to improve technology and for Student-Athlete Advisory Committee programming, and to educate student-athletes, coaches, administrators about sportsmanship and ethical conduct. The second speaker will be Carol Howe-Veenstra, the athletics director at the College of St. Benedict. She will comment both from a personal and institutional perspective about her involvement in an institutional initiative grant program that enhanced her professional development. T. J. Shelton, seated to my right, is the assistant athletics director at Washington University. He has been involved in the minority male enhancement grant programs. T. J. will also share with us some helpful hints for successful grant acquisition. Finally, we will have the opportunity to hear from Meg Stevens, a former student-athlete at SUNY-Cortland, who also serves as chair of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Division III athletes now have the opportunity to participate in regional leadership conferences, and Meg will tell and show us about this experience. Meg is seated also to my right.

Before I turn the microphone over to our testimonial speakers, I want to provide you with a brief overview of the initiative grants programs. The following slide provides a summary of the amount of funding provided during the first 2 1/2 years of the initiative program. As you can see, \$22,000 was allocated in year one to improve the Division III Web site. Also, a total of 70 conference technology grants allocated in two phases were made available to conference offices. These latter grants have been utilized in many creative ways: To improve conference communication; for compiling statistical records; or to upgrade conference Web sites. In addition, \$33,000 was made available to 58 independent institutions to attend NCAA regional seminars, and \$75,000 was spent for the travel of faculty athletics representatives to attend their annual meetings.

The next slide summarizes the number of individuals who took advantage of the enhancement grants. At the bottom of the page, you can also see that 17 strategic alliance

matching grants were awarded at a cost of \$1.3 million. The matching grant program, which requires the sponsoring institution to contribute a portion of the recipient's salary over a three-year period, has attracted strong interest from the membership and is a program that will have significant impact in providing administrative opportunities for women and minorities.

Internships have been another very popular grant program. As you can see from this slide, the Initiative Task Force has awarded almost a half-million dollars to support intern grant proposals. Another major funding area has been for the initiative grants for institutions and conferences—\$1.2 million has been awarded in this category since the inception of the program in 2001-02. Over the past two years, 68 conference SAAC grants have been awarded. Also, grant funding has been allocated for student-athletes and campus leaders to attend two regional NCAA leadership conferences. The first of these conferences, held in Boston this fall, was a huge success. Shortly you will hear and see how the money designated for this purpose is being utilized to benefit Division III student-athletes.

A very important decision at the October meeting of the task force was to allocate unused 2001-02 initiative funding for use in 2002-03 and in 2003-04 and to reallocate funds from one area of the initiatives to another priority. The criteria for reallocation was based upon perceived needs, feedback from the membership and to improve the quality of the grant proposals. The first of the next two slides identifying the reallocations indicates that those funds were directed to internships, professional development for senior woman administrators and grants for travel to NCAA regional seminars.

The next slide identifies the reallocation of funds to be available in 2003-04. One hundred fifty thousand dollars will be used to add interns for women and minorities; \$300,000 for initiative grants to support diversity and membership education and student-athlete welfare. Each of these areas will be provided \$100,000. Also, the task force recommended that a maximum of four grants, awarded at the discretion of the selection committee, be increased to \$15,000 each.

Finally, the task force, with the approval of the Management and Presidents Councils, reinstated \$150,000 for conference technology and \$20,000 for conference SAAC grants.

The slide before you summarizes the Division III budget for 2002 through 2004. I believe it is useful to point out that the base budget for initiatives has dropped by approximately \$200,000 from year 2002-03 to 2003-04, while the 2003-04 budget for new initiatives has doubled from the prior year. Also, you may be interested in knowing that the allocation of resources to support nonchampionship initiatives in 2001-02 was about 15.5 percent of the overall Division III budget and is expected to be about 25 percent in 2002-03.

Also at its October meeting, the task force developed an assessment plan to assist with the overall review of initiatives. An essential component of the plan was to establish tools that will be used in the next review to occur in the fall of 2003. The list of assessment tools is before you. Two important outcomes that the task force is expecting the grant recipients to provide are quantifiable measurements of the benefits of the grant program and feedback on the long-term viability of the initiative.

At the conclusion of the four presentations, time will be provided for questions. Please hold your questions until the end of all of the presentations. Now, let's hear from our speakers. I would ask Gary to come forward and give us the conference perspective.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Thank you, John. As John mentioned, I've been asked to speak briefly of three particular areas that are funded through the NCAA grant program—the conference technology grants, the conference SAAC grants and in our particular case, the utilization of the WIAC for an initiative grant funding area.

Under the conference technology grants, many of you may be aware that each confer-

ence is entitled to up to \$10,000 per year to use for improving or enhancing technology. The three major areas in which most conferences choose to utilize those funds are Web site development and enhancement; computer hardware, such as laptops, printers and scanners; and computer software, such as statistical programs or other types of software programs to assist in the areas of officiating and championship management programs. Obviously, all of these programs and all of these things that were used by the funding that was provided have a considerable extension out to our membership. Everything that benefits the conferences obviously benefits a huge portion of our membership. So they have a wide reach.

We also used this to enhance communication not only between the conference and its institutions, but also to our other constituencies that we may have out there—student-athletes, media, fans and so forth.

In terms of the SAAC, each institution is entitled to \$100 per student for up to two student-athletes per institution. Again, the major areas in which this funding has been utilized by our conferences were to conduct in-person meetings of our conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committees. In some cases, the funding was used to get some of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committees up and running. Oftentimes these funds were used to provide lodging, travel and meals for student-athletes to meet and become an integral part of the governing process at their particular institutions. Funding was also utilized by some conferences to provide educational programs to their conference SAAC committee members in areas such as leadership, drug and alcohol education, and sportsmanship.

The third area that I want to touch upon briefly is the initiative grant area. In that particular area, there were three major categories: student-athlete welfare; membership education; professional development and diversity. In the case of the WIAC, we elected to conduct a comprehensive sportsmanship and character in sports study, which involved having campus conversations on each one of our nine campuses involving all the constituencies that are involved in intercollegiate athletics: student-athletes, coaches, boosters, administrators, faculty, institutional administrators and so forth. We brought these various groups together in an attempt to try to identify—which is extremely difficult, I'm sure a lot of you have probably experienced trying to identify exactly what sportsmanship and good behavior is—and then come up with some strategies of how we might be able to improve and influence positive sports behaviors on all of our campuses. In our particular case, we've come up with a list of strategies that we're going to be implementing conference-wide. One in particular that I do want to mention that we just got off the ground, in part because of the grant money that we received through this program, is the WIAC Ambassador Program. We have designated individuals on each of our campuses to be outfitted as WIAC ambassadors in an effort to try to influence positive sports behaviors during our athletics contests. We're very excited about that program. Obviously, because we've just gotten into it, we don't know what the effects of that are going to be, but hopefully it will be very positive in terms of sports behavior at our athletics contests. I also do want to mention that our particular study will be posted on the Division III Web site for many of you who would like to have access to the complete study to find results and the strategies that we implemented.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that particularly in the case of the top two that I mentioned—the conference technology grant and the conference SAAC grant—I would suggest to you that those two particular areas really have a wide-reaching effect on the membership. I'd like to thank the task force and I'd like to thank the Presidents Council and Management Council in particular for reinstating the conference technology grant and also increasing the allocation to the conference SAAC grant dollars. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Carol Howe-Veenstra (College of St. Benedict): When the announcement was made regarding the new initiative grants, our athletics department was very excited. We have so

many projects on that everlasting list of: "Great ideas, just waiting for money." After reviewing that list, we chose the area of student-athlete welfare and began the process of brainstorming for ideas from staff and students. We were very appreciative that the NCAA application form allowed for creativity yet followed logical steps that helped us to develop our plan.

In the midst of our third or fourth or fifth draft, we realized this first one would be the hardest. It is much easier when following a model. The second grant took a lot less time to prepare. As a women's college, our division of student development has a focus on women's leadership and was encouraging each individual department to plan its own programs. At the same time, one of our coaches attended a CHAMPS conference that focused on the text "The Leadership Challenge," by Kouzes and Posner, as the basis for learning about and practicing leadership.

Out of these influences emerged our first grant: WILD (Women in Leadership Development). This grant utilized the funds to provide a first-year student-athlete workshop led by SAAC members who received training in facilitation. Using the five leadership practices from the text, the workshop provided information and discussion opportunity for all participants. In addition, a facilitator's handbook was created and the department library resources were increased. Funds were spent on promotion, supplies, refreshments and T-shirts. We found that is very, very important. Give-aways, T-shirts and food really helps our programming.

One of the best outcomes of this effort was our ability to create a consistent message about leadership to all members of our athletic department and have a common language that each team could use. SAAC members were highly visible and given the opportunity to mentor an incoming class. We saw WILD T-shirts being worn on campus, creating an even more positive image of our student-athletes and giving recognition to SAAC.

Our second grant—Mental Toughness: Psychological Skills for Competitive Excellence—consisted of training our teams in concepts to improve mental performance. The six areas addressed were confidence, pressure, concentration, reboundability, positive self-talk and visualization. This training involved creating strategies to improve an athlete's psychological skills through written self-evaluation, presentation and team-building exercises. Much of the actual teaching was done by one of our former student-athletes, who had completed an undergraduate degree in psychology and received additional training through an internship. As an all-America soccer goalie, her experience and ability to relate to the current team members made her a perfect leader for this program. One of the strengths of this grant was our ability to involve a network with many other professionals on campus, such as career services, the peer resource center, the psychology department and counseling services.

Receiving these two grants certainly involved work. Time was spent preparing and of course the implementation involved significant commitment. However, there is no question that our athletics department benefitted immensely from these additional resources. Both of these grants also strongly supported our college's mission, stressing women's education, personal growth, integrative and experiential learning. We were able to better serve our student-athletes through new programming, increased resources for the athletic department, and we challenged our coaching staff to creatively integrate these concepts.

Finally, on behalf of the SWA enhancement grant, I was able to participate in the Denver NACWAA HERS Institute for Administrative Excellence. Spending a full week this summer as a student again was incredible, especially when it meant listening to and having dialogue with many of the top female leaders in sports today. The institute challenged all 40 women to become exhausted in our sharing and learning. We studied the history of women's sports, discussed current administrative issues and balancing budgets. The curriculum provided

personal and professional growth, with a variety of topics, such as conflict resolution, personality styles and legal liability. We covered areas that applied to all divisions, helping us see a view from the top, yet providing practical ideas to take back to our institution, no matter where or at what level we worked.

By participating in this course, I was able to increase my own skills as an athletics administrator, gained strength and clarity in my leadership, and brought new energy back to our college. Given the budget challenges most of us face these days, having a couple of extra thousand dollars for professional development was just not available. The NCAA grant allowed me and many other women to participate in this remarkable experience, and I'm most grateful. Thank you. (Applause.)

T. J. Shelton (Washington University, Missouri): It is an honor to speak to you today about two outstanding professional programs: NCAA Minority Male Leadership Institute and the NACDA Management Institute. Designed by the Minorities Opportunities and Interests Committee, with the sole purpose of enhancing opportunities for minority males in the pursuit of senior-level positions, the journey began in August 2001. The 12-month program consisted of four weekend training sessions and one week-long intensive training session. The four topics included: leadership and administration; human resource management; financing and fund-raising; and media, public, and booster relations. The week-long intensive training session focused on conflict resolution, key issues in athletic administration, along with enhancement of skills and athletic administration as well.

The program was held in Indianapolis at the NCAA headquarters. The cost to the institution associated with the program includes hotel and travel arrangements. The NCAA provides all program material and meals during the weekend sessions. Facilitators included experts in those fields, NCAA staff, and directors of athletics from member institutions, who all provided first-hand experiences that were very helpful in terms of our journey throughout that 12-month program.

You may ask is the program a success? As I stand here today, I say yes. As a member of the first graduating class of 2002, of 20 individuals, 10 currently have received promotions internally or externally, including one director of athletics.

I'd like to thank key individuals at the NCAA who played a vital role in this organization—Dan Boggan, Ron Stratton, Cedric Dempsey, Charles Whitcomb, and Eugene Marshall—for their support. Rochelle Collins, a member of the professional development staff, provided expertise and treated us first-class in terms of setting this journey. Currently, the second class is in session and they will graduate in June 2003. For the third class, applications are taking place at this time. Their first class will begin in June 2003 and graduate in 2004.

The NACDA Management Leadership Institute, a 2 1/2-day seminar conducted after the NACDA convention in June, provides skill enhancements related to athletics administration. There are three levels to the program. Level one focuses on principles in management and organization. Topics included doing the little things in athletics administration; current issues in athletics; and lessons for life. Level two focused on leadership and professional conduct in athletics administration. The Franklin Covey four rules of leadership were talked about in this session, including modeling the way, enlightening the staff, empowering, and then setting a vision—one of the most important aspects of department athletics.

Level three, the advanced level, was successes in athletics. The most important part of that included a survival guide for athletics administrators, media, marketing and branding. Key facilitators during the highlight of this program included Gene Smith, Arizona State University; Dave Hart Jr., Florida State University; former athletic director at Georgia Tech, Homer Rice; and teaching the Franklin Covey series was Patrick Baughman. The cost associated with this program was a \$300 registration fee. If you have minorities on staff, only

they can apply for a \$1,000 scholarship in conjunction with the NCAA and NACDA to cover your registration fee and the travel expenses.

Overall, both of these outstanding programs provide outstanding network opportunities. One thing that the NCAA has provided with this program is the ability to network with different individuals and succeed down the road. Thank you. (Applause.)

Megan Stevens (National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee had some of its finest days this November when it saw the results of three years of hard work and ingenuity. The first Division III Regional Leadership Conference took place in Boston and was a huge success. The conference was designed after national SAAC members attended the NCAA Foundation Leadership Conference and noticed the low numbers of Division III student-athletes because of the lack of CHAMPS/Life Skills programs at many Division III institutions. The regional leadership conference will touch hundreds and hundreds of Division III student-athletes over the next three years.

The main goal of this event is to enhance leadership skills and educate Division III student-athletes, coaches and administrators about the NCAA, our division, campus, conference and the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I encourage you to take this opportunity for yourself, but most importantly your student-athletes, to make sure your institution gets involved. I promise you it will be an opportunity and experience that lasts a lifetime.

We will show a video that highlights the first Division III Regional Leadership Conference.
[Note: An audiovisual presentation was made.]

T. J. Shelton (Washington University Missouri): As a member of the selection committee, I first want to say that I was not dancing. That was all interns. (Laughter.) As part of the selection committee, we wanted to offer some helpful hints. The selection committee is made up of different administrators, presidents and the NCAA staff.

Here are some key points on your screen:

- Support the institution conference office when they issue a policy.
- Is diversity a part of your university or conference mission? It obviously assists in your securing that grant.
- Richness and clarity. Obviously a detailed description of how to get an impact to get initiative on campus. In terms of mentors on your staff, who's going to serve as a mentor and their role within the department.
- Creative, innovative. The different job duties they perform, the different aspects, student-athletes getting involved in this aspect.
- Degree of impact. The number of people you'll interact with. What is the breakdown of your current staff? The faculty on campus, and the campus in general and the community that you live in. Obviously, some of these individuals can serve as role models in terms of student-athlete action.
- Articulation of need. Why you need the program and how it's going to benefit you.
- Opportunity for professional growth. This is obviously a chance for the interns to attend conventions, NCAA Conventions and NACDA conventions; various campus workshops and conference meetings.
- Strategies and benefits to increase diversity. Once again, how is this going to impact your campus? Obviously, in athletics it gives you an opportunity to be a leader in your campus and provide some support. You must have clear direction and role on how it would impact your department. Obviously, some of the activities in terms of coaching positions are tied together with some of these positions, but it's very important that they have administrative roles. The majority of them will be administratively as well, so they get the right experience.

- Clearly defined evaluation process. Once the projects are set, meet with individuals within the department. How can they evaluate and grow?
- Detailed budget. This is very important. Held benefits, provided housing, travel expenses to conventions, office space, computer. How would that impact your selection?
- Support of campus environment. Very important to have a mentor outside of the department to whom this individual can speak to on a regular basis if they have issues within the department or on campus. Thank you. (Applause.)

John Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Thanks, T. J., for those helpful hints and to all the presenters for some very valuable insights into the initiative grant process. I know that you as the membership have found all of those comments very helpful. Thank you.

After hearing these informative presentations, I know many of you are thinking that you want to get your campus involved in one or more of these initiative programs. This slide before you now and the one following provide the application deadlines and notification dates. Please do not feel you have to copy these dates. All of this information, including the application procedures, are available on the NCAA Division III Web site. The Web address is [www.ncaa.org\divisionIIIinitiatives](http://www.ncaa.org/divisionIIIinitiatives). This Powerpoint presentation is available on the Web site as well. Grant applications are available at the NCAA education services booth and located outside the meeting room. I also notice that the table in the back far left-hand side of the room has some of the applications there as well. Kim Ford in professional development will be at the booth that I just mentioned and welcomes your questions about the application process.

Before I provide an opportunity for questions from the floor, I want to recognize the members of the Initiatives Task Force. The names of the individuals and their campus affiliations are listed on our final slide.

I now welcome questions for our panel or questions dealing with the process and the application procedures.

If there are no questions, I thank you for your patient attendance and again thank you to all the presenters. (Applause.)

Ms. Landman: Thank you, John, and the rest of the panelists. I hope what you've heard this morning inspires you to take advantage of these programs and resources. They can truly make a real difference. With resources as tight as they are on many of our campuses, here are some opportunities for you to do those things that you wish to do with money outside that restrictive budget. I also want to point out that it's not just institutions; it could be collaboratives of institutions or conferences that make application for these grants.

I had alerted you to a very special treat early in the presentation this morning, that we would be visited today by Myles Brand, the new president of NCAA. Although he is now a day older into the job, he has been here less than two weeks. But already he has reached out to Division III in a way that promises a great deal for our institutions. You know that Myles Brand comes to us from a presidency at Indiana University since 1994. But I believe he has been a president for over 14 years. So let me with no further ado turn the microphone over to President Brand for his thoughts this morning. (Applause.)

NCAA President Myles Brand: Thank you. Thank you for giving me at least a few moments to talk with you during this important business meeting. I am learning at this Convention. There's no question about it. The learning is thrilling in many ways. I'm learning more about Division III, about the strength of its institutions, the strength of its conferences, and the diversity of the institutions as well. I'm learning about the mission and philosophy of Division III. I think it's a terrific group of schools. What I take away is a clear

understanding by Division III of the importance of its success for student-athletes. In the end, it really is all about the student-athletes. I cannot think of a group of schools that's more committed to that important philosophical stance.

I won't repeat to you today what some of you heard last night in the speech, but I will provide an opportunity, if you like, to ask questions or for comments, give me advice. I'm still the new kid on the block. Is there anything else you might want to say? Hearing and seeing none, I take it you all agree with everything I've had to say. (Laughter.)

I look forward to working with the strong leadership of this division. I look forward to working with the representatives of the schools and the conferences as we go forward. I have great optimism and enthusiasm about the future of Division III, indeed the future of all of the NCAA. I look forward to working with you and certainly coming to know you better. Never for a moment hesitate if you want to contact me. E-mail, phone, Pony Express, whatever it is, I'm more than happy to meet and talk and learn from you. So thank you very much. (Applause.)

Ms. Landman: Thank you very much for taking the time to be with us. I do think it's a pivotal moment for the entire NCAA, not just Division III. One of the things that we have already started to do, with Ced and certainly you heard last night that Myles will be continuing, is that we need very much to get the message out of the range of institutions and students and principles that undergird our organization. If you've not had a chance to tune to Channel 31 and look at some of the tapes and programs that have begun to get this message out to the public, I urge you to do so. They're inspiring. I think it will give us a jumping-off place to tell our message more effectively. But I know, as Myles has indicated, that he's very much focused on this as one of the outcomes of strategic planning and the message of the NCAA is in fact, although federated, it is not separated.

So at this point let's take time for a break. We're going to keep it to 15 minutes. I may end up doing what Bob mentioned last night. Because of the bus problem, we didn't get our meeting started last night right on time. If you know anything about the chair of NCAA, he wanted to start whether there were people there or not. I may use that motto. So, please, a 15-minute break.

[Note: A 15-minute recess was taken.]

Financial Aid Audit Task Force Report

Ms. Landman: All right. We are ready to begin. Our next topic is an update on the work of the Division III Financial Aid Audit Task Force. To present this report I am pleased to introduce Kevin LaGree, president of Simpson College. Kevin serves on the Presidents Council and chairs the audit task force. Kevin.

Kevin LaGree (Simpson College): Thank you, Bette. And thank you for allowing me to provide you with a brief update on the progress of the Division III Financial Aid Audit Task Force.

As many of you know, the task force is composed of representatives from the Division III Presidents Council, from our Management Council, from the Financial Aid and Awards Committee, as well as financial aid administrators from Division III member institutions. A full list of the membership can be found at the NCAA Web site, on which you will find an entire screen set aside for this task force.

The task force was charged with developing an efficient and effective financial aid audit process to address membership concerns about the packaging and awarding of financial aid for Division III student-athletes. It was initiated by action of this Convention in 2001 adopting new legislation, which required some procedure for audit.

In the last year, the task force has met in person and by telephone on several occasions

and thus far has developed several consensus items about the proposed audit. Once again, if you'd like to know more about these in detail, either contact me or go to the Web site where there's a long and very detailed list of what we're doing.

The first consensus item is that an internal auditor outside of the athletics department needs to be the person in charge of the audit. Based on the results from the pilot audit developed by the Financial Aid and Awards Committee last year, it was agreed that the high costs associated with an external audit was not warranted.

Secondly, only freshmen and transfer students should be included in the audit. The task force has agreed that if any preferential packaging based on athletics is to be done, it is most likely to be done in the recruitment of incoming freshmen and transfer students.

Third, there should be some financial aid comparison that would show financial aid from all sources of student-athletes and compare that to nonstudent-athletes with similar need.

Fourth, there should be demographic information included in the audit. Because disparities in packaging of students with similar need may be based on demographic variables such as race, gender, geography and academic performance—none of which have to do with athletics—the task force agreed that institutions should include such information in the audit.

Fifth, the audit should be sport specific. Reviewing the financial aid data for student-athletes as an aggregate does not, in the task force's view, appropriately illustrate whether or not an institution provided athletically related aid to student-athletes in only a specific sport.

Finally, the Financial Aid Awards Committee view. Every institution can thereby, through this process, we hope, review its own performance annually. In fact, the essence of this legislation and this practice is to provide an instrument for each institution to analyze and audit its own performance in the packaging of financial aid. In addition, it would be the responsibility of the Financial Aid and Awards Committee to review the results from institutional audits annually. The committee will randomly review some number of audit submissions each year, as well as those audit submissions with results that when comparing the financial aid for students and student-athletes are not within to-be-determined variances. If an institution's comparative data fall outside that range of those variances—and again we've not determined what those will be—the Financial Aid and Awards Committee will first enter into discussions with the institution to gain further understanding of the variance.

It's clear, as we've talked about this around the country to various groups, including the National Association of Financial Aid Administrators, that the combination of the terms NCAA and audit creates an impression of this device being something that's intended to do enforcement and compliance from the get-go—to catch people in doing something that's wrong. That's not the case. While we want to and will reserve the right to enforce our rules in Division III, the purpose of the audit is to help each institution understand and practice what is done in that institution. Where there are variances, the Financial Aid and Awards Committee will be able to have a conversation with that institution to clarify them.

All of us understand that the packaging of financial aid for students is very idiosyncratic among our institutions. It takes place in a very dynamic environment. We know that variances can occur for reasons that have nothing to do with an intent to break the rules of NCAA Division III. The purpose of this review by the Financial Aid and Awards Committee is not to initiate enforcement procedures, though that of course remains a possibility, but first to engage in conversation, to understand what's going on and why.

Finally, we've decided that the only way for this to work in an effective way that will manage the time of financial aid officers and others on campus as well is through an electronic reporting mechanism. Some of you may already be using the NCAA's compliance assistance

software on your campus. Given the recent improvements in the technology of that particular software and work by the NCAA to adapt it to our needs, and the membership's readily accessibility to that software, the task force has agreed that institutions would submit data on this audit through the NCAA compliance assistance software. They would be able to be uploaded from the institution to Indianapolis to the NCAA. The software itself is Internet based so institutions would be able to submit their data to the NCAA via the Web. At the time of submission, institutions will be able to explain any variances, if they wish to.

Institutions may need to develop ways for data to be imported from their current financial aid data banks into the compliance assistance software. In fact, we think that's essential. We've talked about on the task force the possibility of actually funding the development of such an instrument, but we've discovered that there are a variety of financial aid packaging softwares in use at institutions. There are some institutions that use none or have grown their own. So what we're going to do through the NCAA funding will be able to work with individual campuses to help the implementation of that software on campus. That's one of the reasons why we're asking, as you'll see in a minute, for another year before we bring you a proposal.

We would like to test this out . We think this will work, but we remember the Florida election and the promise of computerization. We think this will work. We would like it to capture data that already exists in financial aid packaging software at institutions, transport it into compliance assistance in ways that are consistent, both in terms of identification through taxonomy of the individual data in each cell, so we're comparing the same data from each institution, and so that the capture is done at the same time in the financial aid packaging process so that there's a comparison that's equivalent for both student-athletes and nonstudent-athletes.

Here's the time line that we're looking at. NCAA staff has already begun work tailoring compliance assistance software. You're seeing some screens that show you what that looks like, once you log onto it, for use in the financial aid audit process and they'll continue working on that through this spring. In the fall of 2003, the task force will call upon a select number of institutions to perform the audit in a prepilot to uncover any unintended consequences prior to this Convention next year.

If our proposal for legislative reform is adopted and this audit procedure is put in place by action of this Convention next year, we will propose to you that the first year of the audit, 2004, that all the audit data be done by all member institutions and that everybody would be participating in a pilot program. So it would be a pilot program in the first year in which everybody would participate. It would give the Financial Aid and Awards Committee a chance to examine the data, to see how it works, give each of you a chance to try it out, give us feedback so that we can continue to perfect it. Then assuming that we work out the bugs, the first formal submission of data under this proposal would be in the fall of 2005 for the 2004-05 academic year.

I'd like to commend the members of our committee who have worked extraordinarily hard and very creatively. We've been greatly helped by the assistance of the financial aid officers we've had on the committee. They've helped keep those of us who get great abstract ideas about how this can be done simply tied to reality. We've been able to work through very carefully the problems that have arisen. There may still be some others.

We'd have time for one question here. But if nobody has questions or if there's only one more in place, certainly you could contact me directly or any other member of the task force. We're going to continue working and perfecting this through the year within the context that I've described in this presentation. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Ms. Landman: Thank you, Kevin. As you heard, the task force has made significant progress during the last year in designing a reporting process that will permit us to better

address this issue that is so fundamental to the underlying philosophy of Division III. We look forward to additional work by the task force and its legislative recommendations for next year's Convention. Use this time now for the members of the Management Council's Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee to please approach the dais.

Our next discussion topic relates directly to legislation we will consider this afternoon—Proposals 41 and 41-1. The members of the Management Council's Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee will take the next few minutes to review the development of that legislation and how it would be applied if it were adopted to begin this session. I would like now to introduce Steve Argo, who chairs the subcommittee and also serves as commissioner of the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference. Steve.

Steve Argo (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): Thank you, Bette. Good morning, everyone. I'm Steve Argo, commissioner of the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference and chair of the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee of the Division III Management Council. Please allow me to introduce my fellow subcommittee members: Amy Ashbrock, our student-athlete representative; Susan Bassett, athletics director at William Smith College; John Harper, director of athletics at Bridgewater State College; Bob Malekoff, athletics director at the College of Wooster; Les Poolman, athletics director at Dickinson College; Connee Zotos, athletics director at Drew University; and ex-officio member Chris Walker, faculty athletics representative at the University of Redlands and Division III Management Council chair.

At this time, we would like to spend a few minutes discussing the proposed playing and practice seasons model, Proposals 41 and 41-1. First, I will share some brief opening remarks. After that, Connee Zotos will overview the model and discuss it as a foundation for discussions regarding the future of Division III. Lastly, Bob Malekoff will act as facilitator for membership questions and feedback.

Some of you may wonder about the evolution of the subcommittee's proposed playing and practice seasons model. It all started in October of 2001 when the Division III Presidents and Management Councils charged the subcommittee with the task of thoroughly reviewing Bylaw 17, with a specific goal of making it more consistent. The Council felt that this type of thorough review was necessary in light of the inconsistent approaches found in Bylaw 17, the lack of any basic principles within the bylaw, and the impact that sport-specific legislation adopted over the years has had within the bylaw.

The subcommittee was specifically asked to review the feasibility of establishing more uniform start dates, establishing a consistent number of weeks in all sports, and reviewing the number of contests per sport in relation to the total length of the season. Needless to say, this type of comprehensive review was no easy undertaking. For this reason, the subcommittee sought feedback from various constituencies. Membership feedback has proved to be invaluable throughout this entire process.

By January 2002, the subcommittee was considering three alternative models. By May 2002, the subcommittee had narrowed its options to a model that was circulated for review and comment from the Division III sports committees, coaches associations, the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport, and the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Based on the feedback from these groups, the subcommittee created a revised model, which the Council agreed to sponsor as legislation for the 2003 Convention.

Throughout this past fall, the subcommittee heard from many in the membership regarding the proposed model. It was this final round of informal feedback that motivated the subcommittee to again revise the model, creating an amendment-to-amendment, Proposal 41-1, that allows for greater institutional autonomy and discretion while maintaining the most significant principles and component of the model, such as length of play-

ing season and contest limitations. With Proposal 41-1, the model's application is simple and less confusing; however, the model's goal of consistency is still accomplished.

The subcommittee's comprehensive review of Bylaw 17 has been a long, arduous task. Still, throughout the process, the subcommittee's goal has remained constant: To create a playing and practice seasons model that is consistent with the Division III philosophy, that is consistent for all sports, and that provides opportunities for student-athletes to pursue excellence both in athletics and academics.

At this time, Connee Zotos will briefly overview some important highlights of the model. Connee.

Connee Zotos (Drew University): Thank you, Steve. I'm going to try to share some general principles of the model. But if you want better detailed explanation, turn to Appendix B on Page 93 of the Official Notice. That has the model exactly as it is. It is much more sport specific than I'm going to deal with.

It's important to know that right from the get-go the subcommittee chose to focus its attention on four key areas: the total length of playing and practice season; start and end dates for practice and competition; contest limitations; and preseason scrimmage opportunities. As Steve mentioned, the original mandate was to review Bylaw 17 and try to create a little more consistency within the bylaw. But I think it's even more important to mention that when these conversations were just beginning, so were the conversations with the future group. So we were one of the first committees that had the opportunity to start thinking about these things from a real philosophical foundation and framework rather than just a practical approach. Our entire discussion came from the philosophical foundation.

Before we started dealing with any of those four elements, we tried to answer one very significant question: How long should single-sport athletes be formally engaged in their athletics experience during the span of one academic year? How long could we still provide a rich experience yet create that balance that we're looking for in academics and to allow athletes to enjoy other activities that they can experience during their college life? The principle that emerged after countless discussion and a real variety of opinions was that we could feel comfortable at this point in time as a first step that a maximum of 60 percent of an academic year be spent formally engaged in athletics. So everything we did from this point on had that as our basic model.

Once we went ahead and reviewed the common practices of most teams, we found that most teams were really only using 17 to 19 weeks. The 60-percent rule does bring you to 19 weeks. We felt pretty comfortable coming back from the 21-week rule that we have currently, to the 19-week rule.

The second philosophical question we dealt with was how often should athletes be competing per week. The decision was made that one to two times per week as an average was reasonable. After factoring in the five weeks in the nontraditional season and thinking about how long preseason preparation and teaching should take place, we decided that we would take these principles of contest limitations and adopt them to nine-week playing seasons in the fall and the spring and then 14-week playing seasons in the winter since the winter does not have nontraditional opportunity. That is how we came up with contest limitations. In addition, we applied two scrimmages that can be used by anyone who cares to use it.

I'll quickly go over the model's application in the various seasons. Fall, as you know, was already pretty self-limiting. In our first model that we sent out to the membership, we had talked about starting our fall seasons a little later, around September 7 or so, to give us a better opportunity for preseason preparation and the teaching that we don't currently enjoy. However, there was such a high amount of membership feedback that asked to continue to allow competition on Labor Day weekend because it was a great time to get in a cou-

ple of contests before school actually started, that we decided to go back to really what it is we do now or the original model, that competition can start Labor Day weekend, that we have 16 preseason practice opportunities, and football pretty much stayed the way it was also.

The winter sports establish a 19-week season. So start dates are counted 19 weeks back from selection date of the NCAA championships. With the exception of basketball, we've decided to leave competition start dates for winter and spring up to the institution. As usual, for times when athletes are home for at least a week during Christmas, they do not have to count in that 19-week evaluation.

Spring sports are almost identical to winter, except you count back 14 weeks from the selection date to establish practice start dates. Competition start dates are also left up to the institution and weeks off also don't count. Due to safety and weather concerns, we've left rowing as it is where they can split their 19 weeks differently, using more than five in the nontraditional season if they care to. This model also still accommodates institutions that administer golf and tennis programs in the nontraditional season as their traditional season, but still limits, like every other sport, to the 19 weeks.

Hopefully, I've addressed some of the philosophical principles and how they affect application in the model for you. As a sidebar, I recall that Bette's discussion this morning on how even she as an academic, who is so passionate about her field, struggles with the more-is-better concept and creating balance. I just really want to make it clear that that is the foundation of this committee. We did not go sport to sport and say, we're going to cut this, we're going to add that. Not at all. We took two philosophical principles that both dealt with how much time should an athlete be investing in their athletic experience and can we create a model where every athlete is expected to do the same, regardless of sport. Then we just applied the sports to the model. That was all to create better balance and try to resist that more-is-better approach that some of us, I think, have fallen into.

So we hope that we'll get your support for these philosophical positions. Right now, Bob Malekoff is going to come up and entertain feedback and questions from the membership.

Bob Malekoff (College of Wooster): The subcommittee would like to call your attention to the handout titled "Frequently Asked Questions." There are 11 questions.

This document contains answers to some commonly asked questions regarding Proposals 41 and 41-1. While the subcommittee hopes that this handout will be helpful, we realize that the membership may have other questions, concerns or comments regarding the proposed model. So at this time, we would like to open the floor for any additional comments or questions you may have. My colleagues on the committee and I will do our best to answer any questions that you might have.

Seeing none, I'll ask my colleagues to remove their flak jackets and hand those to the Championships Committee at this time. Thank you very much.

Ms. Landman: All right. Thanks to the subcommittee for its hard work and for that presentation. It's a complex issue and I believe they worked very hard to try to make it accessible to even academics like me. The only thing I would say is I had a little trouble reading Pages 93, 94 and 95. We look forward to further discussion regarding this issue this afternoon.

Ira Zeff (Nebraska Wesleyan University): I thought he was asking more for questions, so I didn't get up right away. Do we want debate now or do you want to wait until this afternoon? What's your preference?

Ms. Landman: We want questions and concerns now.

Mr. Zeff: I'm the athletics director at Nebraska Wesleyan University and speaking on behalf of the members of the recently formed Association of Division III Independents. In our business meeting yesterday morning, the association members voted unanimously to

oppose Proposal No. 41-1 as well as 41 in its unamended form.

Independent institutions already are at a significant disadvantage in scheduling enough in-region games to be properly evaluated for championship selection and seeding. Our institutions cannot rely on a built-in schedule of conference opponents. Independents do not have the opportunity to schedule exempted postseason conference tournament games. Those of us who must cross divisional lines to fill our schedules and to compete in open championships will be at a more significant disadvantage because of the differences in length of season and numbers of contests, and the imbalance will be even more pronounced for those of us with dual NCAA and NAIA affiliation and for those of us who recruit for student-athletes or students in general that are in areas where there are a lot of NAIA schools. This is due to the 24-week NAIA season limits and the higher contest limitations that they already have.

Perhaps most of the point is that if this proposal passes, conferences will trim schedules not by eliminating conference games, but instead reducing their nonconference schedules and the student-athletes of independent institutions will suffer the consequences of not having true access to championships. The unavoidable result will be that the quality of the student-athlete experience, both on the field and in the classroom, will suffer. Our student-athletes will end up traveling longer, missing more class time, with fewer championship opportunities, all at the greater expense of our institutions.

Proposal 41 and 41-1 might be a more viable option if our student-athletes were in support of reduced seasons and playing opportunities, but in fact our institutions' Student-Athlete Advisory Committees and our National SAAC reps have made it plainly clear that quite the opposite is true. We should take this occasion to listen carefully to our student-athletes and their interests, especially when the evidence suggests that the academic performance is no worse and in fact may be better when student-athletes are involved in regular practice and competition.

On behalf of the Association of Division III Independents, I urge your opposition to Proposals 41 and 41-1. Thank you.

Ms. Landman: Thank you. In order to move this along, if we could differentiate between those who are taking a position, which you will have a chance to make on the floor this afternoon closer to the time of vote, which may mean that the impact of your position on this will have greater relevancy at a time when people are thinking about this for the vote. But if you have questions about the proposals for which you need clarification, then let's take those at this time.

Walter Johnson (North Central College): I'm trying to figure out why this proposal had within the body of it a reduction in the number of contests. I understand the philosophical approach. What concerns me is that this is at least the second time since my involvement in the NCAA that we have looked at reducing the number of contests. I believe in 1989 or 1991, when we adopted the reform package—I'll use basketball as an example—there were 27 dates of competition, which were reduced then to 25. Again, I only use that as an example.

I'm not opposed to this legislation. I'm not opposed to the philosophical approach behind it. But I have a concern that somehow the older we get, we tend to forget one thing: Kids want to play. The more you reduce the opportunity for them to play, I think it limits some of the experience that they have that allows them to enjoy the entire college atmosphere. Again, I'm not opposed to this legislation. I just ask the question: Why did we tie reduction of competitions in with a reduction of practice?

Ms. Landman: I'm going to ask that someone from the committee address this question from the floor. Will one of you come to the microphone and respond?

Susan Bassett (William Smith College): I'm a member of the subcommittee. I remind

you that we didn't look to reduce or increase anything in terms of number of weeks or contest limits. We looked to define a Division III athletics experience and then we built up seasons and competition from there. The premise was what should a Division III athletics experience be? About 60 percent of their time. A rule of thumb was to quantify dates of competition of one to two, to arrive at the total number of competitions allowed in each sport. So it was seen together as the overall athletics experience in a Division III sport.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): When I look at No. 2, what are the main goals of the model? I fail to see why what we have as an existing set of rules and regulations does not answer those questions in the same manner. I also don't understand how 60 percent was factored in. That's a very convenient choice that gets you to 19 weeks. Sixty-five percent gets you to 21, which is what we have already. All sports are not in fact treated equally, which was one of the tenets. Because as soon as that question or format is put forth, we begin to see the same thing happen that's already in the bylaws—many changes to handle specific sports and specific situations.

I applaud the committee's work. I know it took a long time. I also know that we were asked for input. I was actually called by one of the committee members and asked to provide input. I returned five phone calls and was never called back. Some of this doesn't smack of being better than what we have. I heard a lot of discussion yesterday at the tables of if it isn't broken, maybe we don't need to fix it. I think many of these questions could be answered the same way if you looked at current legislation. We do have things that are responsive to this. I don't think we need a reduction. I don't think it brings about what you're after.

My question is how did we get to 60? Was that a convenient number to get you to 19? I don't see a real difference in 65. The assumption in this is that all of us use 21 weeks. We don't. Many of us don't use full practice opportunities during those weeks. To me, this removes all flexibility we have to control our programs for our institutions.

How did you get to 60 versus 65 and why do you feel the answers to No. 2 aren't answers that currently exist with the legislation we already have?

Connie Zotos (Drew University): Getting to 60 was such a long process, I don't think there's any way we could articulate all the conversations that took place to that point. We first looked at in a standard playing season. With your preparation time and then your contest time, what would be a good, rich experience, factoring out any form of nontraditional and whatnot? We dealt with that issue first.

We were not prepared to say that the nontraditional was unimportant. So that had to be factored in as a piece of the extension of a good experience. To just hash through it and hash through it, 50 percent felt pretty good—half the academic year. I'm not going to say we don't think the nontraditional is as essential. We weren't ready to take that giant leap. That's a giant leap. We felt comfortable getting to the 60 percent.

It was going to be impossible to satisfy every single person's opinion. But after we got to 60 percent, we looked back and said what does that really mean in a 30- to 32-week academic year? That came out to 18 or 19 weeks. We started looking at what most sports do and felt that that was a pretty reasonable compromise. That's where we went from to define the rest of the parameters of this model.

Cheryl Pasbrig (Wisconsin Lutheran College): I'm looking for clarification. Will golf and tennis, which compete traditionally in the fall season, be given 16 practice opportunities or will practice start August 24?

Steve Argo (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): It's my understanding they're going to reduce the practice opportunities.

Jeff Dense (Eastern Oregon University): I have a question concerning student-athlete welfare. I'd like to use an analogy about the American electoral system. Many people per-

ceive that the electoral system is too long and there's too much money and too much political advertising. So one of the recommendations has been to perhaps limit the length of electoral politics, particularly the running of political ads. My response to that is we're going to see more ads within a shorter period of time.

My question to the committee members is how is the possibility of increased hourly demands on student-athletes within a shorter period of time—as there is less time to prepare for success—how does the current proposal address that possibility that we may see an increase in the hourly demands on student-athletes within a shorter period of time?

Mr. Argo: I'm not sure I understand your question. We were looking to broaden the student-athlete's experience in the entire college experience. In other words, we tried to find a percentage. As Connee said, it's not a perfect percentage that we're looking for to put student-athletes' time solely in athletics, but we're looking at the opportunity to allow student-athletes to experience the overall college experience and perhaps there are some other experiences that would be available in that other 40 percent of an academic year. If you want to re-ask the question, I'll certainly try to answer it.

Mr. Dense: I guess the question deals with how the other divisions have an hourly limit in terms of participation. What's to say that within a shorter time period, given the increased demands of success with athletics assessment within that period of time, that there won't be increased demands on student-athletes in terms of athletic endeavors within the season, not outside the season.

Mr. Argo: I certainly think you're not looking at an increase. We've been given the question about the 20-hour week and currently continue to study that. But we don't consider any extra time being put into the student-athlete's experience here.

Susan Bassett (William Smith College): I'd like to respond to Chuck Gordon's comment and question about 60 percent versus 65 percent. That's exactly what we hope will debate the merits of this legislation. We're hoping that we can look at this not as a sport-by-sport analysis but on the merits of the premise upon which we developed the proposals—a rule of thumb of roughly 60 percent. If there is an issue within the group about how we quantify that, I hope we can talk about whether 60 or 65 percent is the best. To back up a moment, I would tell you that we took as direction from the membership's vote of two years ago restricting the nontraditional seasons in field hockey, soccer and lacrosse as a mandate on the number of weeks. So in essence, field hockey and soccer, for example, had already gotten to roughly 18 or 19 weeks. So we were taking that as a message from the membership that we shouldn't ignore.

Ben Shipp (University of Mary Hardin-Baylor): My concern and the concern of my conference has to do with that each sport is inherently different. The piecemeal approach that we talk about and legislation that's been approved over the last several years, I agree that it has been piecemealed. But that has come a lot of times from the coaching groups themselves to talk about the differences in their sports.

I am concerned about the information that came out that most sports already use 17 to 19 weeks. I don't know where that research came from. I know in our conference that is not the case. The difference between the sports that use 17 now and those that are using 21 are the sports that I'm talking about that are different. I think we need to be very careful when we're trying to force all sports into one model. They need to be examined individually. Some championships and some playing seasons are going to be different from others. I encourage the membership to look at those differences individually.

My concern was where the 17-week research came from.

Connee Zotos (Drew University): We did look at soccer. We looked at every sport. Particularly in the fall, it was already self-limiting to 17 or 18 weeks. We looked at how often baseball teams can actually practice and what they were actually getting in and that kind

of thing. By our best judgment and talking to coaches and other people that is what we determined.

But I want to take your remarks a step further. Again, I can't stress enough that we were looking for setting expectations on athletes that are consistent from sport to sport. We're adhering more or buying into more this idea of balance for every athlete, whether swimmer or soccer player. That is what we're looking to support. I ask you to really look seriously at the sports that have endured a little bit more of the cuts here and really try to determine whether it has in your mind been that damaging; whether the experience that these athletes are going to get is going to be that significantly different or whether they will still enjoy a solid athletics experience. Talking outside my committee role, from a personal role, I believe they would still enjoy a very rich experience under this model.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): Did anyone do research on the recently completed reduction situation that we just went through, spent a whole year with, particularly sports like baseball and softball? We reduced the amount of contests that they were to be allowed in legislation two years ago. Now we have completed a full cycle. Did anyone do research to see if in fact what we chose two years ago was pretty good or not good? Did those individuals experience too much time at practice and games? We spent a lot of time here two years ago making decisions about reductions and now we're saying that wasn't good enough, we're going to cut you again.

Steve Argo (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): Again, we get to the numbers game and we could knock it around all day long. But you're right, when we looked at the average and looked at one or two contests per week, we didn't consider that someone was going to gain or someone was going to lose. We got to the numbers basically on the idea of one or two contests per week. You're right, we were here just a couple years ago talking about baseball and softball contests. But the fact is there will be some sports that will lose contests if we're trying to get that particular number of an average of one to two contests per week.

Mr. Kaiser: Did the group do any research to find out if what we just went through, that we voted on two years ago was good or bad?

Mr. Argo: I wouldn't say we went through research. We took each sport and looked at it, obviously. But as far as research is concerned, we simply looked at the contest average per week and this is the number we came back to.

Susan Bassett (William Smith College): As a point of information, we did contact the baseball coaches association and got specific feedback from them prior to our deliberations.

Championship Issues

Ms. Landman: Thank you. For the remainder of this morning, or until we run out of time on this particular topic and have time perhaps to come back to this, we will review issues related to championships. Championship issues are always of interest to the membership. This year, we have especially significant topics to discuss. We will focus on team-sport automatic qualification and Proposal Nos. 42 and 43. You also will hear important information regarding revised travel policies and selection criteria. To lead this session is Brad Bankston, chair of the Championships Committee and commissioner of the Old Dominion Athletic Conference.

Brad Bankston (Old Dominion Athletic Conference): Bob, now I realize why you wanted to pass your armor off. We certainly have some good things to bring to you this morning. Good morning to you, and thanks to President Landman and the Convention planning group for allowing the Championships Committee to present to you. This is my third year on the committee and second as chair. It seems just like yesterday I was in front of this

group asking for feedback on the AQ process and the potential of a survey coming back to you. This morning, I'm explaining two legislative proposals—a draft of selection and seeding criteria revisions and more travel policy studies. Here's a quick review of the four parts of the presentation.

First, we'll provide an update on several of the travel policies that were instituted last year, as well as update you on the championship future host manual, which has been completed by the committee. We'll cover a review of the present selection criteria and suggested changes that the committee has been working on over the past few months. We'll cover a brief state of the Division III championships budget and discuss Convention Proposals 53, 43, and 42, providing an opportunity to educate the membership on the makeup of both Proposals 42 and 43. In the end, we'll have time for questions and answers. I'd encourage feedback on all the agenda items at that time.

Before we head into the material, I'd like to introduce you to the members of the Championships Committee who are with me on the dais. First, Steven Argo, commissioner of the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference; Amy Campbell, director of athletics at Bryn Mawr College; Suzanne Coffey, director of athletics at Bates College; William "Bill" Eng, director of athletics at Bernard Baruch College; Jamie Flucker, student-athlete representative from the SAAC, past student-athlete at Carthage College; Mary Jo Gunning, director of athletics at Marywood University; Chris Walker, current chair of the Management Council and faculty athletics rep from the University of Redlands; and Steve Wallo, the director of athletics at Lewis and Clark College. In addition, we welcome three new members to the committee in 2003—incoming chair of the Management Council and director of athletics at William Smith College, Susan Bassett; director of athletics Susan Chapman from Worcester State College; and commissioner John Cochrane from the Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I would also like to recognize our departing members for a job well done. Thanks to Mary Jo Gunning and Amy Campbell for their service over the years; and a special thank you to Chris Walker for his service while chair of the Management Council. It's been a pleasure working with all of you. In addition, we do have some new faces from the NCAA staff perspective. John Williams is our liaison; John's to my left. Tina Krah and Kerri Fagan as well are doing a wonderful job supporting this committee through the governance structure and the staff of the national office. So we appreciate your work, John, as well as that of Tina and Kerri.

Since our last presentation at the 2002 Convention, we've come a long way. From the referral of Proposal 47 and the passage of Championships Resolution No. 48, the committee has delivered on its promises. It's worked diligently to survey the membership on various portions of the championships structure, including automatic qualification; the definition of a region; the application of AQs in individual team sports, as well as seeding and selection criteria. Through the survey, the committee obtained valuable information from you, the membership, which allowed us to move in the direction we've taken within this year's committee presentation. I look forward to bringing you the committee's message this morning.

At this time, I'd ask that Jamie Flucker come forward to present the committee's report on championship travel policies and provide information on the championship hosting manual, which was recently completed. Jamie has been a valuable member of the Championships Committee while serving in conjunction with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee in Division III, and she currently serves as vice-chair of the national SAAC. Jamie Flucker.

Jamie Flucker (National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Over the past few years, the committee has worked with the NCAA staff to find ways to make headway with the travel policies associated with NCAA championship participation. The first change to be implemented following the survey of 2002 comes in the definition of region. The question was

posed and a majority of the respondents were in favor of seeing the definition of a region expanded. The new rule, which will be in place for the 2003-04 academic year, allows competition located within 200 miles to count as in-region competition. The committee understands this new policy will not help all schools in every sport, but the committee hopes it will allow those schools at traditional rivalries that are located across the arbitrary regional line or schools that have not been able to play in-state competition due to the state being divided into as many as three regions.

The committee continues to review the travel policies that were put into place following last year's Convention. Last year, beginning with the winter sports, the committee, along with the Management Council, approved the move from a 400- to 500-mile radius to qualify to fly for championship play. In addition, the committee and Council also approved the policy of hub airport travel, which requires a school, provided there are known cost savings, to fly into or out of a hub airport if it is within 150 miles of the championship site or 150 miles from their campus. Both policies have proven successful at saving the division financial resources to the tune of over \$150,000. We are focused on studying these policies through January 2004 in an effort to have complete data over a two-year period.

After that time, and with the help of the NCAA sports committees and staff, the committee will review the data, weighing any concerns of missed class time and added stress on the student-athlete with the final financial numbers accumulated over the two-year study period. The committee will make a final recommendation on the policies. They also will study the possibility of providing ground transportation to all participants in NCAA play. Currently, only schools busing to sites within 499 miles or those flying into an airport that is over 50 miles away from the championship site are reimbursed for ground transportation.

As we continue our study of championship transportation and institutional responsibilities for specific championship expenses, the committee has asked the NCAA financial services staff, along with Worldtek Travel, to estimate the costs associated with providing ground transportation to all participants in NCAA Division III postseason competition.

Championship hosting manual. Over the course of the past two years, the committee has been involved in an in-depth discussion on championship hosting, dating back to a presentation in front of this body in January 2001. Through that research, the committee decided to create a Division III future host manual, which includes essential items for potential hosts of Division III national championships. The committee wants to encourage more members of Division III to bid to host all rounds of championship play and hopes that this manual will serve that purpose. The manual contains helpful hints from hosts, commentary from past hosts of championships, facility forms and examples of proposed budgets. The manual will be available following the Convention online through the NCAA Web site. Additional information on its location will come by letter from the NCAA championships staff in mid-January. The committee would like to recognize NCAA intern Brad Taylor for his invaluable assistance with this process. Over the past semester Brad has worked diligently to complete this project in a short time frame. Our thanks for a job well done.

Brad Bankston (Old Dominion Conference): Thank you, Jamie. Now we turn to the second portion of this morning's presentation covering the committee's current discussion on selection and seeding criteria. After valuable feedback from the membership in the comments section of the 2002 survey, as well as numerous letters, the committee began a review of the current selection and seeding criteria, which has been in place since the inception of the AQ process in 1999. Much feedback has surrounded the idea of providing encouragement to play better, stronger competition and a continued study of the difficulty of comparing teams nationally using regional criteria.

While the draft may not solve all the perceived issues within this area, the committee certainly believes we're on the right track. Steve Wallo, the director of athletics at Lewis and

Clark College, led a discussion on selection and seeding criteria at a meeting of all team sport chairs held in September of this past year. At that time, Steve presented a draft of a proposed revision to the current guidelines. After receiving comments, the committee took the suggestions of the chairs and worked toward the draft that you see in front of you. At this time, I would like to bring Steve forward to lead us in this portion of the discussion. Steve.

Steve Wallo (Lewis and Clark College): Thank you, Brad. Good morning. My role here today is to summarize our committee's work on the selection criteria. We determined changes were needed due to the feedback and information provided by individual sports committees and from the membership as a whole. To initiate these changes, we determined that it was critical to work within the existing principles that have been approved by this membership and that drove our initial set of guidelines in 1999. While maintaining these foundation principles, we address the inconsistencies and problems brought to our attention regarding the existing criteria. I urge you to review these changes thoroughly. If you are not currently on or have not been on a sports committee lately, discuss the changes with someone who has served in this capacity. Because although what I'm about to present may look similar, the changes will be substantial in easing the work of the committees and addressing the concerns of the membership.

The foundation principles include: automatic access for qualifying conference champions; equal access to independent or nonqualifying members; and an emphasis on in-region competition. Much of the additional feedback received had to do with the inconsistency of the application of many of our criteria between sports. Therefore, we also spent a considerable amount of time defining and clarifying the application of the existing criteria. As I address a summary of these changes, it is also critical to keep in mind that these changes are proposed with the understanding that future bracket expansion is likely. It was our opinion that the existing criteria would have been much more efficient with expanded brackets. Therefore, along with bracket expansion, modern adjustments and clarifications of our existing model, we would address most of the membership's concerns.

We will remain with a three-pool system, although with some modification. Pool A remains as the automatic berth pool from qualifying conferences. There is no change. Pool B remains as a pool for independents and those from nonqualifying conferences. We have presented a ratio change as part of this proposal. The number of Pool B berths will be figured by utilizing the actual access ratio in Pool A. We will take the ratio derived by taking the total number of AQ champions over the total number of teams competing in those qualifying conferences and apply that ratio to the total number of teams in Pool B. That will determine the Pool B berths. In this way these two pools of members are essentially guaranteed the same ratio of access coming out of both A and B selection methods.

Pool C will then become what most would recognize as a traditional at-large pool. After Pools A and B are selected, Pool C would be selected from drawing from all remaining members. These changes have several advantages. Members from Pools A and B will still be guaranteed equal access for the berths available in those two pools. This will result in a slightly larger Pool C that in turn will allow for more flexibility on the part of the sports committee, will increase the number of comparison contests for review, and will create a true at-large pool, which will result in a stronger overall bracket. A note of clarification here is that these pools are to be selected in order—A, B and then C.

There remain two types of criteria: primary and secondary. In each, the criteria itself is to be evaluated individually and with all criteria weighted equally. There are five primary criteria. Keep in mind that the order of these presented is not a factor. All five must be evaluated. Most you will recognize. Some are new or have been additionally defined or clarified. The five are: win/loss percentage in region; strength of schedule; head-to-head com-

petition; in-region results against common opponents; in-region results against ranked teams. As a clarification, ranked teams are defined as any team that ever appears in an official ranking.

The most substantial change in the primary criteria is the creation of a strength-of-schedule index. This was created in order to define the term "strength of schedule" in a measurable way. This criterion has been a source of concern for most sports committees. Strength of schedules has been interpreted in many different ways, from sport to sport and indeed within a sport from year to year. We didn't exactly invent the wheel with this new index. It was actually adapted from an index proposed by one sport and already in use at another division level. However, we believe our tweaks have now balanced our need for an index and our principle of encouraging in-region competition. This index was presented to the sports chairs in the fall and was very well received—so much so that a few sports have elected to utilize it this year.

Again, these five primary criteria are to be evaluated all with balanced weight. If after that analysis, to compare two or more teams, a decision cannot be made, the committee moves to the secondary criteria. Secondary criteria contain six required and one optional criterion. Again, most are familiar; however, some adjustments have been made. The six are: out-of-region head-to-head competition; overall Division III win/loss percentage; results against common non-Division III opponents; results against nonregion Division III ranked teams—again, once ranked, always ranked—overall win/loss percentage; and results against common out-of-region opponents.

Once again, all six criteria are evaluated with the equal weighting. The optional criteria would be developed and proposed by individual sports committees, which feel that performance during the final 25 percent of the schedule is important as criteria. The full criteria does go a bit deeper in order to clarify how criteria are to be implemented so that we can maintain the consistency between sports. Again, that criteria is in the yellow handouts at your tables.

The Championships Committee also looked at several other areas related to the selection, pairing and bracketing of championships. The Championships Committee's proposal regarding pairings and site selection clarifies the intent of the original language. To retain the fiscal responsibility and to allow for us to engage in the new initiatives, such as bracket expansion, that ominous term of geographic proximity will remain with us. Geographic proximity has seemingly been applied inconsistently from sport to sport and year to year. Geographic proximity will remain as a primary factor regarding all pairings and site selection. The quick definition of geographic proximity is the elimination of as many flights as possible while using the simple rule that 500 miles constitutes a flight. In other words, geographic proximity and pairings take precedence over rankings or seedings. While this is certain to cause some conference and higher-seeded early round pairings, the financial and lost-class implications are too great not to hold true to this principle. As a representative of an area of the country, the Northwest, in which one division—in which the next Division III conference is isolated by over 1,000 miles from us, this is a difficult issue for me to present. However, the fiscal situation and our responsibilities within Division III are clear.

The committee is also proposing mandatory published rankings for all sports. The first mandatory ranking would occur at midseason with additional mandatory rankings the final two weeks of the season. The selection criteria above have been adapted so that they can be used in their entirety throughout the ranking process and therefore become a resource for the membership.

Hopefully, my presentation has helped you understand the efforts that we've undertaken to address the concerns of this membership. While no model would perfectly fit everyone's ideas, I believe that along with expanded access, we presented a good model for

addressing sport equity with our original principles in mind. We're proud of the work we've done and of our ability to be responsive to the concerns of the membership. I truly believe that with the adoption of these proposals, we will make the sports committees' daunting task of selection and bracketing much more efficient and certainly less frustrating for the membership.

Brad Bankston (Old Dominion Conference): Steve, thank you very much for your leadership in this discussion, not only here but also within the Championships Committee.

Please remember that this is a working draft. We would encourage as much feedback from the membership as possible as this discussion continues within the committee structure.

Before we venture into the world of Convention proposals, it's important to take a minute and update you on the state of the Division III budget. I'm sure many of you may remember a discussion of just a year ago in which I came before you speaking of a \$770,000 deficit and the need to conserve division funds. Although my message of conservation certainly continues today, I do come to you with good news. Following the 2001 and 2002 championships, with help from the Initiatives Task Force, lower travel costs and modified travel policies, the division's championship budget ran in the black by approximately \$295,000. We must remember that you can control and establish travel policies to help relieve pressure on the budget such as those mentioned earlier. But you will never be able to control who makes the fields, how far they advance and the cost of transportation. Those are major factors in the bottom line of the championships budget each year.

The following two slides show a snapshot of the 2002-04 NCAA Division III biannual budget period. Looking at the 2002-03 budget, there are three new funding pieces in place. The first is the standard 4 percent inflationary and enhancement increase that shows \$385,000. Each year, the championships budget is increased by 4 percent in an effort to keep up with the increases in travel costs and general inflation. This number was adjusted from 5 percent to 4 percent recently to better reflect the actual rate of inflation and enhancements occurring from year to year. The \$422,000 figure in base budget adjustments that you see was implemented in this year's championship budget as an effort to shore up some of the sports in which we had fallen behind budgetarily.

Finally, I will call your attention to a prioritized goal from last year's presentation—the implementation of a \$500,000 championships contingency fund to help cover the budget overages from year to year. The committee would like to thank the Management Council and the Presidents Council for recognizing the impact of this and understanding that this fund would maintain a \$500,000 figure in a separate pool so that it would only be tapped in the event that the championship budget would go over.

It's important to know that this is a one-time expense and something that the committee believes is essential to the long-term viability of the Division III championship structure. There are no additional expenditures in the 2003-04 budget, with the exception of the \$419,000 enhancement and inflationary increase, which accounts for an additional \$419,000. It's the belief of the committee, as well as the Division III Budget Committee, that these additions will help alleviate many of the budgeting woes that we've suffered through over the past few years. These increases to the budget account for an additional \$1.2 million over the two-year period.

The second budget slide refers to the overall championships budget and the amount of unallocated funds from year to year. You've seen a similar slide this morning in the Initiatives Task Force presentation. Currently, the division requires a 15-percent reserve. As you can see, the amount of unallocated funds in 2002-03 is \$1.4 million. That figure is then used for additional championships expenditures and initiative expenditures over the coming years, leaving us \$437,000 short in the year 2003-04. The years following this bia-

nual period pushed the 15 percent reserve figure to the limit. The division will have very few additional resources for allocation until the 2006-08 budget cycle, assuming that a championships expansion model passes later this afternoon, which would have a 2005 effective date.

Moving on to automatic qualification and its review. Originally, when the AQ legislation was proposed at the 1999 Convention, it was developed and consistent with two key principles. The first was primary emphasis placed on in-season conference and regional play and to provide equitable access for conference members and independent institutions. The remaining portion of the presentation this morning will focus on the automatic qualification process and a thorough evaluation of the proposals on the agenda this afternoon.

Taking a look at a quick review, the following charts will provide you a picture of the current bracket and pool numbers in all the team sports. The charts will show a breakdown of Pools A, B and C taken from the most recent membership numbers. In reviewing these slides, I call your attention to three sports specifically: women's ice hockey, men's lacrosse and women's lacrosse. All of these fields needed to be adjusted to maintain the minimum of two Pool C berths. The committee added the needed berths this year to assure all sports at least two slots in Pool C.

Additionally, the committee made a move to collapse Pools B and C in women's rowing. Presently, there is only one conference in the division that meets the AQ requirements in rowing. Because the committee did not want to guarantee the conference in question two berths in the current structure in A and C, the committee placed the pools together, allowing the remainder of the field to be selected at large. This is believed to be an extenuating circumstance and by no means indicates a move in the direction of combining Pools B and C in other sports. The committee believes in the equal pool access in Pools A and B with reasonable at-large opportunities in Pool C.

The committee continues its study concerning increased access in all sports, not only team sports but also individual team sports as well. Automatic qualification in the sports of tennis, golf and cross country continue to be in the national discussions. Currently, the Championships Committee is requesting additional information from all three of these four committees concerning their thoughts on the following two items.

The first is the possible elimination of the individual portion of their championship, and secondly, the impact of automatic qualification on their championship. This item is on the agenda of the Division III Championships meeting in January. Additional discussions are expected this spring prior to the committee forwarding a proposal to the Management Council concerning this issue. Other field enhancement requests from individual team sports possibly not involved in the AQ discussions, as well as those involved in the AQ discussions, have been received and reviewed. It's the committee's intent to handle the team sport issue first and resume its study of the individual fields immediately thereafter. In addition, we continue to monitor site-selection philosophy in process, discussing the merits of predetermined sites, long-term contracts, sponsoring agencies and on-campus versus off-campus facilities.

Prior to entering the portion of the presentation covering the two automatic qualification models, 42 and 43, for your consideration, the committee would like to update you on Proposal 53. Proposal 53 would create a national collegiate women's championship in bowling. Currently, based on the numbers at hand, Division III has only two institutions sponsoring bowling as a varsity sport. Twenty-six Division I schools and 14 Division II schools, based on the numbers I have, currently sponsor the sport. The funds to support this championship would not come from the portion of the budget allocated for Division III, but come from the overall national Association budget. The committee asks for your support of this proposal.

Now the championships expansion, something I'm sure you're all very interested in, in Proposals 42 and 43. Reflecting back to last year's Convention, the Championships Committee promised to return with legislation to help alleviate the pressure on the current AQ process. We worked within the division structure to gather information. We thoroughly reviewed that information and determined a course of action. Of course, we believe it best reflected the thoughts and feelings of the membership as a whole. The survey results were released on the NCAA Web site with trends and comments presented at the annual commissioners' meeting,. The committee met in June to make its final recommendation on legislation.

After careful review, the championships group looked at all possibilities and decided to go with a model that closely mirrored the original principles of the AQ process while providing what it believed to be more than adequate access in Pools B and C, all within the overriding theme of equitable access in all sports.

This morning, it's the committee's job and my job to explain the governance structure's Proposal 42 and also educate you on the additional proposal for your consideration, Proposal 43, sponsored by the UAA. While both proposals look very similar in numbers, they have their own inherent differences in determining the initial size of brackets and reactions to future membership growth. Following this morning's presentation, members of the Championships Committee, along with UAA commissioner Dick Rasmussen, will be available for questions and answers concerning both proposals. The committee has worked with the UAA in an effort to educate the membership on the two proposals. I personally would like to thank Dick Rasmussen and his staff for their cooperation in this endeavor.

Earlier in the presentation, I mentioned a yellow handout that was in front of you. You're going to need to refer to that along the way. The information comparing the two championships models was a collaborative effort between the UAA office and the Championships Committee. We will begin with a few notes about the two proposals. Both proposals are based on 2000-01 sponsorship numbers. Cost estimates in the comparison are based on a three-year average that includes 1999 through 2001 data, including the year in which we were over-budget. This is a very conservative figure.

The football bracket is assumed to be capped at 32 teams, which constitutes a full five-week championship experience. Both call for an August 2005 effective date, just two years away from this coming fall. Both determine the pool allocations in the same manner. Pool B is conferences that meet the requirements set forth by the Management and Presidents Council. Pool B is determined by taking the true ratio of A, dividing the number of eligible A institutions by the number of AQs and applying that number to the eligible number of Pool B institutions to determine the Pool B allocation. Pool C is the remaining number of berths left over after determining Pools A and B with all institutions eligible to receive Pool C slots.

Let's begin with Proposal 43, sponsored by the UAA. This proposal was in front of you a year ago as Proposal 47, and the committee asked that you refer it back for further study. You obliged and allowed us to include its information in the survey. The version you see is slightly modified from last year's model. The sponsors of this proposal believe it solves the inherent problem in the current championships selection process, the lack of Pool C berths, which is caused by the number of AQ conferences. The model is driven by the number of AQ conferences in each sport by adding more Pool C berths in response to the number of AQs. It responds slower to sponsorship growth with an original 1:8 ratio, thus helping to control future costs as long as members enter as independents or as members of existing AQ conferences.

In the event members enter the membership as independents and then form new AQ conferences, with the necessary time span of two years for the formation of a new conference, the model reacts by adding berths to the bracket to compensate for the addition of new

leagues. It also provides the Management Council a mechanism to override the bracket formula in appropriate circumstances. The model works in this way. You take the sponsorship number, you use the 1:8 ratio by dividing the sponsorship number by eight. You then round down, then reserve half of that initial field for at-large berths—Pools B and C. You take that number, divide it by two, adding the number of AQ conferences to create the field for each championship.

Here's an example using the numbers for women's basketball. Using the sponsorship of women's basketball, 386 with 36 AQs, you divide the field, creating the initial field, 386 by eight. You come up with the number 48. You reserve half of that field, the initial field for at large, which would be 24, then you add the AQ champions to get the final field of 60. The resulting bracket size would be 60 teams; 36 of those berths being AQ berths, 24 of those berths being at-large berths.

The proposal sponsored by the governance structure is Proposal 42. Its bracket size is dependent on sports sponsorship in each sport. It provides a formula that reacts quickly to sponsorship growth, thus adding more berths to the brackets as sponsorship numbers grow. Pool C access in this model would not fall below two berths unless compelling situations mandated otherwise. The model provides a method to accommodate any change in the divisional structure by being based solely on sponsorship numbers and not dependent on AQ conferences, the dynamics of which we all know could change dramatically with any move to subdivide.

It is consistent with the original AQ principles established in 1999 and approved by this body. Perhaps most importantly of all, it applies a consistent bracket ratio of 1:6.5 for all 14 team sports involved. It's makeup is simple. The field sizes are determined by dividing the number of sponsoring institutions by 6.5.

Here's an example using the same women's basketball numbers from the Proposal 43 scenario. Three hundred eighty-six members with 36 AQs. Dividing 386 by 6.5, you establish 59.38. Rounding down, in this case to the lower number, you would have resulting bracket size of 59 teams.

Here's an attempt to show you a few of the key differences. Referring to your comparison chart in Scenario 0 may help. The numbers clearly show that Proposal 42 yields larger brackets in sports with lower sports sponsorship and fewer AQ conferences, while Proposal 43 yields larger brackets in sports with higher sports sponsorship and more AQ conferences. Looking further and deeper into the numbers, Proposal 43 yields better initial Pool C numbers in four sports; Proposal 42 has better Pool C numbers in three sports. But the two models are identical in seven sports.

In response to membership growth, Proposal 42 responds quicker to sponsorship growth by adding more berths to the field, while 43 responds slower to growth. Forty-two responds to conference formation over time by applying equitable pool allocations, while Proposal 43 responds to conference formation by adding one berth for each new conference over 50 percent of the initial bracket size. As stated before, Proposal 42 applies a consistent bracket ratio of 1:6.5 for all sports, while Proposal 43 shows resulting bracket ratios ranging from 1:6.2 to 1:7.25.

Here are a few scenarios for your review. All four of these can be found in the back portion of your yellow handout. Look at a sample of all four of them within the Powerpoint this morning. We certainly don't want these numbers to confuse you. I think it's important for you to recognize that these are how the models would react to membership growth over time, in some cases as many as five years.

First we look at three sports from the baseline proposals, which reflect no changes in the membership, using the 2000-01 sports sponsorship numbers. We look at the difference in the two models when comparing men's basketball, women's lacrosse and women's ice

hockey. My comments will reference comparisons to the baseline model, which is Scenario 0 of what I'm going to say here in the different scenarios down the line.

Scenario 1 depicts a membership change that would take two years to accomplish. With the new leagues having to apply for membership and wait the two-year waiting period, unless they were granted a waiver, here's how the models react. Clearly, Proposal 42 doesn't move. We've had no change in sponsorship, the bracket sizes stay the same. Proposal 43 would shift in this example due to the emphasis on conference formation by changing the bids in all three sports because of the increase in two new AQ leagues. It is important to note that not always will the formation of a new AQ league take from Pool C. Because the schools in this example move from Pool B, the ratio for Pool A increased, the resulting number of eligible Pool B institutions decreased, thus the reduction of the Pool B bids with a minimal change in the Pool C numbers in Proposal 42.

Scenario 2 depicts membership growth that would take a minimum of five years to complete, with the current membership restriction of only six schools entering the provisional period in one year. In addition, once the three years are up with the schools entering, the new leagues would have a two-year waiting period to form as a new AQ conference. You can see here that Proposal 42 shifts to the sponsorship growth with a 1:6.5 ratio and would adjust from year to year with the influx of new members, growing by two to three berths per sport. Forty-three also adjusts with the influx of new members sponsoring the sport as well as new conferences forming two years down the road. It, too, would grow by approximately two to three berths per sport. The sample here shows the final numbers with the membership growth and conference formation complete.

Scenario 3 shows one league forming from Pool B members and another from new members. This would take a minimum of four years to accomplish, with two years for the formation of the league from Pool B members. Proposal 42 grows only due to the increase of eight sponsoring members, and the pools react to the change of schools in Pools A and B. Proposal 43 reacts significantly in this example, adding several new berths to brackets due to the increase in AQ sponsorship, as well as the creation of the new AQ conferences.

Scenario 4 calls for an increase of eight new members with no conference affiliation. This would take a minimum of two years to complete. Once in, Proposal 42's 1:6.5 ratio reacts with a bracket increase, while Proposal 43 notes only slight additions to its bracket sizes. There are changes in the pool allocations for both. There are more schools in Pool B, thus additional Pool B berths in two of the sports shown. A berth is taken from Pool C in 43, but because of bracket growth in 42, the Pool C berth is restored with the increase in the bracket size. Looking across the model scenario, Proposal 42 in this case grows faster in the change of membership.

When looking at all four scenarios, it's important to remember that we're assuming that all new members entering the division are sponsoring all sports. Although highly unlikely, it's really the only way to compare the two models side by side. Currently, with the new membership criteria, it's easy to look ahead from year to year and see the schools entering and recognizing the impact they would have on brackets into the future.

Cost estimates. As we all know, cost estimates are very important, given the continued study of the Division III budget. But given the data used in the survey, the costs are nearly equal for the baseline models. Additional changes in the membership sponsorship over time and the forming of AQ conferences would create different brackets in both models. It's important to note that these changes would not be immediate and the membership would have adequate time to determine its course of action prior to having to spend an amount of money shown in the scenarios in front of you. Implementation of 42 calls for a budget increase of \$1.275 million, while 43 runs \$1.268 million.

The committee thanks the membership and the sponsors of last year's legislation, both

47 and 48. That initial discussion allowed the group to hear valuable feedback, receive survey results and return to the Convention with a model it believes reflects the will of the membership. Clearly, there's a need for more Pool C berths. We've heard you. In an effort to ensure the quality of the fields, while preserving the equality in all brackets, the committee believes that Proposal 42 does just that.

This wraps up our portion of the Powerpoint presentation and allows us ample time to answer any questions you may have on the two models. I'll ask Dick to come forward and answer any questions on Proposal 43, while members of the Championships Committee will remain here on the dais and are available for your questions on the process they used in creating Proposal 42 and/or the property characteristics of that model. I'd also encourage your feedback on any of the other portions of the presentation at this time.

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Before we open it up to questions, Brad, I'd just like to say thank you to you and the members of the Championships Committee for your presentation. The presentation this morning was balanced; it was fair; it was accurate. Throughout this process I've enjoyed working with you and the staff members because you've always had at interest the interests of the membership and wanting to be sure that we have the information we need to make an informed decision. I thank you for that and really appreciate it.

Brad Bankston (Old Dominion Conference): Dick, as I said earlier, I ditto that back to you. We appreciate your cooperation as well.

I'll try to field the questions as best I can. I'm going to start with seven.

Ed Hegmann (Mary Washington College): You mentioned two other presentations that were just heard. The 200-mile radius in-region definition. Since that's going to go into effect in 2003-04, when are we going to know how we apply that 200-mile radius? Are you going to give us some guidelines and is there going to be some kind of method to determine it? Are you going to allow 201 miles to apply or is there a plus/minus?

Mr. Bankston: You had to ask that question. I'm actually going to yield to John Williams on that. We are working within the structure of the championships staff to try to create a model that will help you. We elaborated a little bit on it in the commissioners meeting on Saturday. There are two schools of thought. One, poor Brad Taylor, who started the work on the handbook for us and did a wonderful job. He tried to create a database that you could use as an institution to plug in a member and to find out how far you were from that member based on streets and trips. Is that correct, John? That proved to be a very daunting task. Streets and trips software changes from year to year. Incorporating all that again was really too much to ask. I'm uncertain as to where we are within the process, so I'll ask John to answer your question then.

John Williams (NCAA Staff): We're working with our IT staff right now to develop a program that we'll be able to send out to you. Hopefully, we'll have that out to you by June to let you know when we get this all done. It's a long process. Brad took about a month to try to figure out how to get all the schools into the program. He had only got to the "C's." So this is a long process that we're working with here. But we'll try to get it to you as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. Hegmann: I have another question about the selection-principles guidelines that were presented.

You mentioned this is a draft. When can we expect this to try to go into effect or what's your plan on that?

Mr. Bankston: We're trying to get feedback. We've heard from the membership along the way and believe that we've been able to garner an ample amount of information. We'd like this to continue to get more feedback from the sport committees, which we will be receiving at the end of January in our meeting that begins on the 22nd. I'm hoping, taking

that into consideration, as well as proposing this to the Management Council and going through the structure, that we'll be able to accomplish that fairly quickly.

I have heard and continue to hear discussions from other bodies and feedback that we will be receiving in January concerning a game's a game, there is no region. I don't necessarily think the committee's moving in a direction to accept or deny that, but that's something that we need to discuss within the process. It's something that we will do at the end of the month.

Mr. Hegmann: You mentioned some Pool B and C criteria ramifications. Are you going to publish those somewhere? I'm having a hard time writing down everything you said.

Mr. Bankston: I think that's part of both of the proposals that you'll see this afternoon, and they both incorporate Pool B and C. We're looking into the future and taking not only where we are currently with that selection and seeding criteria, but where we would be moving. Frankly, either one of the proposals, 42 and 43, both use that same pool allocation in B and C.

Mr. Hegmann: Last question. Since rankings are going to be a major part of this, who's going to control the rankings? Is it going to be NCAA sport committees or coaches associations?

Mr. Bankston: NCAA sport committees. We have made a diligent effort in communicating this back to the sport committees. I'm very proud of what we're doing with this. In an effort to educate the membership—again, you hear that word "educate"—but I believe there's a misunderstanding sometimes about the regional poll—I'm using soccer for an example—from the coaches and really where you fall within the selection poll. Hopefully, being able to establish this and create these polls that the membership can understand, you will have a better idea of where you fall within the process before selection day.

Mr. Hegmann: Thanks a lot.

Gary Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Did the committee engage in extensive discussion about the whole regional concept? I understand in theory what we have tried to accomplish there. But I haven't seen any evidence that that theory has actually been put into practice. A great deal of the schedule manipulation, the scheduling avoidance, whatever you want to call it, centers on the whole in-region, out-of-region concept. When you have teams that raise money to go to Florida on spring break for a basketball holiday trip, why that game counts less than a game that's played against somebody in your region.

A lot of the problems that we're experiencing is due to this theory that with what we've put into place and what we're proposing to do in the future somehow is making people stay closer to home. I guess I haven't seen that. I don't even know if I've seen that question being posed or any data being collected along those lines. It seems to me that it's a theoretical concept that has not in my opinion been evident that it's been successful. If an institution wants to choose to play a thousand miles away, that's its decision, that's what institutional autonomy is all about.

I'm just posing the question to you. You mentioned that it's something that's going to be discussed in the future. Was that part of any of the discussion currently by the committee?

Mr. Bankston: We're waiting to get that feedback back from sport committees. I have heard that verbally from people as well, and I believe from you at the Convention last year and your concern about the focus on regional competition. We have not had an extensive discussion on our end and worked within the principles that have been in front of us with focusing on in-region competition.

Steve, I'd yield to you if you have anything else to add to that.

Steve Wallo (Lewis and Clark College): Gary, I think we did have conversations regard-

ing the selection principles and the in-region, and one of the things you'll see at least in the secondary criteria is trying to address Division III competition that's out of the region. Both benefit for competing against ranked teams, even though they might be out of the region, and all the rest of the criteria against Division III teams that are out of the region. It is secondary and not primary criteria, but we did try to address some amount of it in that part of our draft.

Mr. Karner: If you would permit me to follow up on that. How often does the secondary criteria even come into play? Maybe it does more than I could ever imagine. But you could eliminate half the criteria, a lot of the secondary, by not even considering the region concept. It would simplify the whole selection process and it would get us out of this. I know a lot of people have the same problems.

I have to sit there every time and try to figure out what region we're in, and we're in the business on a day-to-day basis. Try to explain it to other people when your men's basketball team is in one region, your men's teams are in another, and your women are in a different region in different sports. It's crazy. I think we could solve a lot of our problems by just admitting to the fact that the regions aren't necessary and they're not accomplishing what we intended for them to accomplish when we put this legislation into place. Thank you. (Applause.)

Mr. Bankston: I think that's been heard. I would say—not to belabor the issue any longer from this standpoint—that I do believe they do get to the secondary criteria fairly quickly in some cases when they're trying to make a decision, based on some of the feedback that I've gotten from some of the sport committees. But I appreciate your thoughts.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): When teams are ranked regionally, does that carry over and count forever? If a team appears in the midseason rankings, as I understand this, you get credit for beating a ranked team. However, at the end of the year, if that team has a very poor back half of the season, your points and the strength-of-schedule index would go down.

A team that's—this is a ludicrous example—undefeated at midseason, loses all the rest of their games and is .500 at the end of the year, you're receiving an undue credit for beating a regionally ranked team at midseason. It adjusts correctly in the strength of schedule because you're only going to get credit or not credit for beating a team that's .500. Yet, as I understand it, these are all equal. All five of these things are equal in nature when the committees review.

I would encourage that you consider results against regionally ranked teams at the end of the season, so that the team that wins all its first half, loses all its second, you don't somehow get credit for that when you are losing it in the strength of schedule above. That appears to be very much an inconsistency. If you really beat a ranked team at the end of the year, you ought to get credit for it. Again, there's no way to know when they're playing their best opponents, what their travel schedule looks like, etc. I would question the continuing credit for beating a ranked team. I would just say use the late-season ranking only for that part.

Mr. Bankston: I know that part of our discussions hinged on where in the season would we start asking committees to rank. In thinking that it was midway through would have been a good idea, you would hope. I guess for a sport that plays more games, perhaps you might have a better idea by that point in time as opposed to the sport of football, for instance. I know that's what we initially thought about, but those are good points that we'll take into consideration.

Mr. Wallo: Chuck, the other thing to keep in mind there that we'll take your comments back in January and look through it again. We did talk quite a bit about that. In your ludicrous example, I think one of the thoughts that we had is there would be some reason that

that team was undefeated at midseason and ranked and then fell off the map and ended up .500. If you played them early, it's probably the result of some situation that happened within that team. You should get credit for beating that team then. They may have been a better team at that point than they ended up being at the end of the season, for whatever reason.

Mr. Bankston: Before we move on, this is a great opportunity to ask questions about 42 and 43 if you have specific issues.

Bill Klika (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Florham): A couple of points. We do get to the secondary criteria, especially when you have this situation in Pool C where you choose a national field on regional criteria. The answer is you do and sometimes you go past secondary criteria.

The football committee used the strength-of-schedule index. We found that the more games you play, the more accurate that is, having used it on a 10-game schedule for football. In some cases, because of regional record, you might only be down as low as six games. For sports that have 30 or 25 games, I think it's much more valid than it is for the smaller number.

Question on ranking. I'm assuming you're talking about regional ranking, not national ranking. The point is when you're dealing with AQs, they may not be ranked in your region. That leads to some problems when you're dealing with coaches polls and our poll. You could indeed have a team that's ranked 10th in your region. But they're from an AQ conference and they're going to get in and they'll never show up on your ranking. Come selection day, the questions you're going to be asked is where did they come from? I would push for the rankings at the end of the year and certainly, as Chuck mentioned, that opponent that went five and five, winning the first five, may be playing the five toughest games on their schedule at the end of the season. Thank you.

Mr. Bankston: We do have sport committees that have not published rankings in the past, and we believe that we're moving in the right direction by trying to educate the membership on the importance of the selection. Frankly, selection rankings that you're working on from the year gives you a better idea where you may stand. But I do understand the AQ issue.

Tom Hart (Webster University): Brad, I'd like to commend the committee for all the work they've been doing to adjust and to hear the different sport committees that have been involved with this issue, and I thank you for that.

I do have a question, however. We're speaking about Proposals 42 and 43. I'd like to ask a question about a proposal or a ramification that none of us have discussed at this point. What would happen to the ratios that we have if we did nothing? I know that for the last three years, as a member of a sport committee, one of the biggest frustrations is that the brackets were capped, you weren't allowed to add as growth occurred. There's been significant growth to conferences. Yet, what happened was, it was a direct influence in Pool C losing bids, in particular in our sport, men's basketball, we watched them dwindle for the past three years because you weren't allowed to increase bracket sizes.

I think the bracket number that initially was used was 1:7.5, if I'm correct. If that's the case, what would happen if we got rid of the apparent moratorium on increasing bracket sizes, if we were to apply the current ratio to the numbers of sports and the schools that are sponsoring them, how would that impact the bracket size? I can't find that anywhere and I'm just curious as to how that would impact it.

Mr. Bankston: That's because it's not in front of you. I think clearly it would increase the brackets because those numbers that you see, within those sponsorship numbers, I believe it's very safe to say are moving targets as to the information that we have from the Membership Committee as to who's sponsoring what sport. I would clearly assume that

those brackets would increase because as you said, you have numbers that have added the sport since we've capped. It's really a range of 1:7.5 to 1:12. It's not a literal 1:6.5, which is what 42 calls for.

Mr. Hart: Just to clarify then -- the current legislation you're going 1:6.5, even though it isn't much lower than 1:7.5, but it enhances it by making it consistent across the board.

Mr. Bankston: Correct.

Mr. Hart: Thank you.

Mr. Bankston: Dick, do you have follow-up on that?

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Yes. Last year, when we put together the data for Proposal 47, we looked at what happens if you chose 1:8, 1:7.5, and all the way down. The increases in bracket size at the level above 7.5 were only about two to three berths in the higher sports sponsorship sports as opposed to eight, nine or 10 berths. So it's expanded, but substantially less. I don't think, from my perspective, that's enough to solve the problems that we have with the current situation.

Mr. Bankston: I would agree with that.

Dennis Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): Brad, I'd like to recognize both you and your committee and also Dick Rasmussen, our friend from the UAA. All of you have worked tremendously hard and I think we're in a win-win situation with two great proposals. So my hat's off to all of you involved.

I would like to try to tie the championship discussion into the future of Division III. I read the proposals that both Dick and your committee have put out. Something caught my eye at the bottom of one of the pages. When we get to 32 teams for football in a five-week championship, we would cap the football championship. Then we talked -- and I'd like to share this with the general membership -- at the commissioners meeting on Saturday about capping of other team sports when we get to 416 members sponsoring a sport, if I'm not mistaken.

Mr. Bankston: Dependent upon the proposal that's in front of you. Four-hundred-sixteen would be a good number.

Mr. Collins: Right, if field size would eventually get to 64, and the figures you've got here are pretty close to 64. I went back and I found out that our current active membership is 410 members right now. I think it's important for the membership to understand that yesterday a lot of people had no interest in reorganization of Division III, whether it be subdivision or whatever. But for championships purposes, we could be bearing down pretty soon on a cap in all of our team-sport championships. So if you have an interest in team-sport championships, this discussion of the future of Division III may have some interest for you because within a year or two we may be capped. If I read that right.

Mr. Bankston: Dennis, I think we were, at least I know I have as chair of the committee. I think the committee has been working within a three-week championship for all the other sports and a five-week window for football, which we're currently playing now. The addition of four more teams would just fully constitute a boundary for everybody to participate in going into the divisional national championships.

Mr. Collins: So basically you're verifying that there would be a cap.

Mr. Bankston: I'm not indicating to you one way or the other. I'm just telling you how it works in the numbers that I've worked with in the past. The emphasis has been placed, by the Presidents Council on three-week championships.

Mr. Collins: I thought it would be interesting for everybody to know that in the context of the future of Division III.

Mr. Bankston: Thank you very much.

Scott Carnahan (Linfield College): Has there been any dialogue regarding preselection of championships sites? It seems, being on the Baseball Committee, there's a possibility of

tremendous savings by the NCAA in allowing more diversity in geographic hosting. Has there been any dialogue or investigation in the possibility of preselecting either conference hosting or individuals hosting sites prior to the season being started?

Mr. Bankston: Are you referring to final sites or regional sites or both?

Mr. Carnahan: Regional sites.

Mr. Bankston: Regional sites. We have discussed, and I think currently there are a couple of exceptions, using baseball as an example of predetermined regional sites. We haven't looked at that extensively and really haven't gotten that much feedback from the sport committees alluding to the fact that they would like to do that, frankly, outside of baseball. But I know that we've seen in cross country that we do that as well.

Suzanne, I know that we've had an extensive discussion about championship posting and site selection. It's something that we continue to take a look at and will be delving into more deeply at the end of January at our meeting.

Do you have anything else to add within that conversation?

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): As Brad suggests, we've been very focused on the possibility of cost savings that are attached to predetermined sites. So far as much as we can make that happen, I believe this committee will be moving in that direction. We will, as Brad suggests, spend more time on that at the end of January.

Connee Zotos (Drew University): I'd like to ask a question as it relates to the information, though maybe ill-timed this morning that the student-athlete gave, but I think very important. Obviously, one of the major differences between these models is that one is clearly an equity model, applying the same ratio, while the other one has a 1:6.2 ratio all the way to 1:7.2 ratio where some sports are going to enjoy better opportunities or more opportunities for championship play than others.

In a closer analysis of that, it does show that 50 percent of the sports that are getting increased opportunities are men's sports and 13 percent of the sports getting increased opportunities are women's. Men are not going to suffer any disadvantage under Proposal 43, yet 38 percent of the women's sports are taking the entire hit in terms of a disadvantage. I just wondered if that was discussed at all by the people who are proposing 43 and what the resulting discussion was?

Mr. Bankston: I'll comment on 42, the committee's process that we reached. We frankly didn't take a look at male/female from the standpoint in knowing that we were applying a ratio that was consistent for all sports and felt comfortable doing that from an equitable standpoint.

Dick, I'd let you answer that and respond.

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): A couple of things. I'll talk in terms of general principle, then I'm also going to talk in terms of numbers because the position that you're stating I don't believe accurately reflects the situation.

When you talk about the equity of either model, it's really determined by how well the model meets the needs of each sport, not whether it treats each sport the same. That's an issue that we went through this morning in some of the discussion of playing and practice seasons. Treating everyone the same is not necessarily treating them equitably because there are different circumstances. Forty-three does start treating each sport the same by applying the same ratio initially, 1:8 to every sport. Then it looks at the needs of each individual sport with regard to the effect of automatic-qualifying conferences and adjusts each sport depending upon that sport's needs in terms of automatic-qualifying conferences. That part of it is determined by the sports sponsorship patterns of our members and their conference affiliations.

If you take a look at the numbers in terms of just the percentages of teams getting increases and so on on your comparison chart, if you added up the columns with the total

bracket sizes for all sports, both Proposal 42 and Proposal 43 result in a total of 502 team berths. That's an increase of 81 additional championship berths from what we currently have. Proposal 42 provides 49 of those for women and 32 of those increased berths for men. Proposal 43 provides 45 of those for women and 36 for men. In 42, there are more berths allocated for women. But to suggest that a difference of four berths for men and women between the two models when overall we're talking about 502 berths I think mischaracterizes this as difference in equity.

Ms. Zotos: I think that if you look at ratios, though, you'll see that three men's sports enjoy a better than 1:6.5 ratio and three women's sports less than a 1:6.5 ratio, with the two outliers women's lacrosse and women's field hockey, all the way down to the 1:7.2. No men's sport goes below 1:6.5. I don't want anyone to think that I don't think that this was an intended consequence; I'm sure it was completely unintended. But after closer inspection of the data, I do believe that it could be perceived as gender discriminating and I'd just like everyone to keep that in mind. Thank you.

Mr. Rasmussen: I really think that it's a circumstance that reflects the sports sponsorship patterns of the member institutions, and it's not something that's necessarily inherent or inherently discriminatory about the model itself.

Mr. Bankston: I don't see anyone else at the mics for questions. I'm sure we'll have additional comments later this afternoon. I know you're all very hungry. I want to wrap this up quick. They're going to hook me over here. Thank you to the committee members who participated in the presentation this morning and the committee members as a whole. I can promise you that their dedication to this in all portions of the championship are second to none. Thanks again for allowing us to present and we appreciate your comments and will take this information back in trying to make the Championships Committee and the process the best that it can be. Thanks. (Applause.)

Ms. Landman: Thank you. We'll reconvene here after lunch at 1 o'clock.

[Note: The delegates recessed for lunch.]

Management Council Election

Ms. Landman: Our next item of business involves the election of our new Management Council members. Recall that under our governance structure, the Nominating Committee initially solicits and selects Management Council nominations. The Management Council and the Presidents Council then review these nominations, but the positions ultimately are filled by a vote of our membership during our annual business meeting.

We have three new appointments and one reappointment. You should have received the slate of nominees with your registration materials. To present the official slate of nominees, I'm happy to introduce Bob Williams, director of athletics at Swarthmore College and chair of the Nominating Committee.

Bob Williams (Swarthmore College): Thank you, Bette. The Nominating Committee wishes to thank first of all the Division III membership for their interest in serving within the NCAA committee structure, particularly in Division III. On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I would like to present the slate of nominees for service on the Division III Management Council. They are as follows: Jennifer Bratten, president, Ferrum College; Michael Miranda, faculty athletics representative, Plattsburgh State University, New York; Sandra Slabik, faculty athletics representative, Neumann College; and Richard Strockbine, director of athletics, University of Dallas.

It should also be noted at this time that the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee appointed Carrie Coachman, Albion College, and Josh Espinosa, Buena Vista University, to serve as the two SAAC representatives on the Management Council. Thank

you.

Ms. Landman: Thank you, Bob. Are there other nominations from the floor? There being no nominees from the floor, all those in favor of the slate presented by the Nominating Committee, please raise your paddles. All opposed, raise your paddles now. Abstentions. Congratulations to our new Management Council members. We look forward to working with you. (Applause.)

I also want to remind the delegates of our new appointments to the Presidents Council. As you may remember, the members of that body are appointed by a vote of the Division III CEOs. Our new member is president Deborah Stanley from State University College at Oswego and also appointed to four-year terms are Richard Berman, Manhattanville College; Ivory Nelson, Lincoln University in Pennsylvania; and Rick Wells, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh.

It is now time to consider our various legislative proposals. To lead us through that process will be Chris Walker, chair of our Management Council. Chris.

Proposed Legislation

Chris Walker (University of Redlands): Thank you, Bette, and good afternoon. I hope you've been enjoying our Southern California weather. Most of us have been inside for a couple of days, but hopefully you've been able to get outside a little bit.

As Bette indicated, we're now ready to consider our proposed legislation. We will consider a total of 14 legislative proposals and related amendments. These are Proposal Nos. 41 through 54 in your Convention Notice and Program. We will vote on these proposals in numerical order as listed in Appendix A of our Convention Notice on Page 92. Also, please remember the editorial corrections found on Pages 5 and 6 of the Convention Program. We will attempt to call those to your attention when we consider the effective proposals. Also, please note that Proposal No. 40 has been withdrawn.

Please remember that you will need both your voting paddle and electronic voting unit for any vote this afternoon. Our procedures dictate that all voting be done by paddle or electronically rather than by voice or hand.

Proposal Nos. 41 through 43 make up the Presidents Council grouping. We will begin with these proposals and conduct roll-call electronic votes for any motion related to these proposals. That includes related amendments-to-amendments, motions to refer, etc., as well as motion to adopt. Bette reviewed the electronic voting procedures this morning. I will not repeat that information.

We will begin by considering Proposal No. 41.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASON—PLAYING SEASONS REGULATIONS

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council and Management Council, and the Playing and Practice Seasons Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

As we discussed this morning, this proposal and the related amendment bring more consistency to Bylaw 17 and strengthen the Division III philosophy as it relates to playing and practice seasons. Over the years, the adoption of sport-specific legislation has created widespread confusion and inconsistency within the bylaw. The primary purpose of this proposal is to create more consistent application among the different sports that occur during the same playing and practice seasons. Another primary purpose of this proposal is to provide opportunities for students to pursue excellence in athletics and academics. This pro-

posal provides the opportunity for student-athletes to adequately pursue their academic endeavors while still enjoying the benefits of athletic competition, championship opportunities, and social and cultural activities of their respective institutions.

In accordance with these ideals, contest limitations generally have been established on an average of one to two contests per week. In addition, each sport, other than football, would receive two exempted preseason scrimmages or dates of competition during the traditional segment, provided that the contest or date of competition is conducted in privacy and no class time is missed. For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

Muriel Howard (State University College at Buffalo): As a member of the Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 41. As you've already heard today, the Presidents Council strongly endorses the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee in its effort to redeem Bylaw 17. Through Proposal No. 41, in conjunction with 41-1, the subcommittee has succeeded in its charge to repair the many inequities that currently exist in Bylaw 17. On behalf of the Presidents Council, the Management Council, and the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, I recommend support of Proposal No. 41.

Steve Argo (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, Management Council, and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, I move the adoption of Proposal 41-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

In response to the concerns raised by the membership, the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee has proposed this amendment-to-amendment in order to ensure greater institutional autonomy and discretion while still maintaining the most significant components of Proposal No. 41. The overall goals of bringing consistency to Bylaw 17 and strengthening the Division III philosophy still remain. However, this amendment will help alleviate confusion and promote a more straightforward application of the overall goals. The adoption of Proposals 41-1 and 41 and will represent modest yet significant progress with the attempt to better balance playing-seasons legislation.

Mr. Walker: Thank you. Also, please note editorial corrections to 41-1 and Appendix B appear in the Convention Program on Page 6. We are focusing on the merits of Proposal No. 41-1. Are there other comments on the amendment-to-amendment?

John McCardell (Middlebury College): I rise to note that the Presidents and Management Councils charged the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee with the task of thoroughly reviewing Bylaw 17, with the specific goal of making it more consistent. In addition, the subcommittee was directed to consider the establishment of more uniform start dates, a consistent number of weeks in all sports and the appropriate number of contests or dates of competition for each sport in relation to the total number of playing weeks. For more than a year, the subcommittee has worked very hard to achieve its directives. Possible models were formulated and feedback was sought from the membership while holding true to its charge. The subcommittee considered the initial feedback and presented Proposal No. 41.

As additional membership feedback was received, the subcommittee was responsive to the legitimate concerns. With this amendment-to-amendment, Proposal 41-1, the subcommittee has succeeded in appropriately responding to the membership while remaining true to its charge from the Presidents and Management Councils. Acknowledging that there is no perfect solution or perfect proposal in such matters, I would urge you to support Proposal 41-1.

Jami Goldman (California State University, Hayward): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to oppose Proposal No. 41-1. Under this proposed playing and practice seasons model, student-athletes lose contest opportunities in a number of

sports. At the heart of our reaction to this proposal is the fundamental idea that Division III student-athletes want to compete in their sports as much as possible. As Division III student-athletes, we make a conscious choice to be part of an intercollegiate team because we simply love to play our sport.

The Division III philosophy states that institutions will support student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletic performance, which include competitive opportunities. The Division III philosophy also states that institutions should give primary emphasis to regional in-season competition and conference championships. This proposal would jeopardize regional nonconference competition opportunities. Since conference games cannot be sacrificed, nonconference games will.

Additionally, with the proposed reduction in contests, independent institutions will suffer disproportionately to peer institutions that are ensured conference competition. Independents rely on neighboring conferences to build strong schedules in the regular season in order to earn at-large bids to the national championships. With fewer contests available, conference institutions will cut independents from their schedules, leaving these programs with potentially reduced schedules and increased travel. For these reasons, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly opposes Proposal No. 41-1.

Todd Hutton (Utica College): The eight presidents of the Empire Eight have voted unanimously to oppose 41-1, not because of the limitations or because of the attempt to create more standard practices. We oppose 41-1 because the preseason is exempted from this proposal and the proposal is not comprehensive enough. Postseason play is exempted from this proposal. It does not address the issue of overlap between seasons and therefore the overcommitment of resources for Division III institutions. It creates two additional scrimmages in most sports, which has a budget impact of about \$18,000 for our institutions, per institution, irrespective of the question that autonomy says you cannot play scrimmages; we all know that there will be tremendous pressure to play scrimmages. It fails to address why sports played during breaks, that is Thanksgiving, the winter break, and spring break, when other cocurricular activities do not and are not involved during those breaks. It fails to go far enough in defining athletics as one among many cocurricular experiences.

For example, one problem would be we allow student-athletes to miss about on average one day of classes per week. We would not permit student government to miss one day per week, academic clubs to miss one day of classes per week, student newspaper, student yearbook, work-study students and so forth. The legislation does not go far enough in acknowledging that we are educating the whole person. We need to encourage student-athletes to write for the newspaper, to act in theater, to make music. It does not provide student-athletes enough time to work. As we know, our students increasingly must work to enable themselves to afford a college education. Finally, it does not go far enough in addressing the presidents' intent to bring athletic competition more into balance with the total educational expense. To be more academic mission driven. The presidents of the Empire Eight urge the membership to defeat 41-1 and to support legislation in the future that puts the "student" back into student-athlete.

Peter Hart (Albion College): One of the main complaints against this legislation is that it fails to acknowledge the inherent differences in sports. I want to address that, because for that argument to be relevant, our playing and practice seasons should reflect those inherent differences. I think the beauty of this legislation is that it has made us aware that's not the case.

I can give you one recent example, men's basketball, where we discussed changing the playing and practice seasons. That was not driven so that the basket was going to be changed to 11 feet or that the court would be widened or lengthened or the number of players be changed. The history of sport in this country shows that playing and practice sea-

sons are arbitrary and often capricious. The beauty of this legislation is that for the first time we will have a coherent, logical system for determining these.

I would like to draw an analogy to our educational component, which also can often have fundamental differences. An English class expects different behavior from the students than from those taking an art class or those taking an engineering class. Yet, all classes on a campus start on the same day and end on the same day. That really is what playing and practice seasons are about. We can and should admit that these have been worked up by coaches associations each with its own limitations and norms that they hope to address. The beauty of this again is that it allows us to see that playing and practice seasons have been arbitrary and we can get back to a coherent system that makes sense for all of us.

Page Remillard (Agnes Scott College): Speaking for the Division III independent institutions. Inherent differences in sport I think are well documented by the fact that golf, tennis and cross country are going to be addressed separately and at another time. I have a concern for that because I think this issue could be better addressed if we did deal with all sports at the same time. My comments are in addition to supporting the statements made by the president representing the eight presidents in opposition to 41-1 and 41.

I heard earlier today about "is more better." I see no proposal that suggests that we ask for more. I ask, is less best? I've heard it come from the podium at different times this weekend that a number of us are not using the full 21 weeks. I think it speaks well for the presidential leadership and the connect that our administrations have with their athletic programs that individual institutions are being monitored from within. I see that as being presidential involvement. I would hope that we could retain the autonomy of institutions to make choices that are particular to their needs both financial and geographical, and academic admission. If the institution may be struggling with it, it would go to the conference level. I'm concerned that we need to pass legislation. I support the rules. But to squeeze the rules down so that we all play on a tighter arena I think is going to pose some difficulties.

But most important, we as a body have spoken at great length and invested significant funds in helping our students become leaders and giving them a voice. I stand here representing Division III independents to say that we don't believe the students are opposed to this because they want to just play games. We believe they're opposed to it because they selected our institutions for their athletic programs to complement, not replace, but to complement their academic experience. They enjoy the access of the peers in their sport. They enjoy the contact that they have with their coach. It may in fact be more contact than they're having with their academic advisors. It may in fact be more influential on their lives.

We heard the speakers last night at the Honors Dinner make reference to their sporting experience. While they represented all three divisions, they were past student-athletes that represented the value of their experience. I oppose this legislation because I don't believe more is better, just as I don't believe doing less is best.

Les Poolman (Dickinson College): As a member of the Division III Management Council and the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, I speak in support of this proposal. It is important to note that Proposal No. 41 is philosophically driven with the goals of bringing consistency to Bylaw 17 and improving both the athletic and academic experience of Division III student-athletes. The proposal makes philosophy-based changes to Bylaw 17 that transcend sport-specific interests. It is the hope of the subcommittee that you look beyond sport-specific concerns to embrace the greater principles upon which Proposal 41 is based. On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, I urge you to adopt this proposal.

Mike Lindberg (Ithaca College): I'd like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 41-1 and 41. Division III prides itself on being more about what is right with collegiate athletics. I

agree with President Landman, who stated this morning that Division III athletics should be philosophically grounded, balanced, that our role is as educators, and our responsibility, is in preparation.

I also agree that we should pay attention to criticism outlined in books like "The Game of Life" but shouldn't react by throwing the baby out with the bath water. We have data too. Data that show our retention rates among student-athletes are higher and their grades are better while playing. Data that show that student-athletes are connected to campus life and they are volunteering countless hours of service to the community. Data that show there's a higher graduation rate among student-athletes and that student-athletes are more willing to give back to the institution after graduation.

Statistics are valuable, but we should also take into account the compelling personal stories, such as the ones shared yesterday by Amanda Walton and other former student-athletes we honored who embody what is good about athletics. To them and thousands of student-athletes, Division III student-athletes are more than empirical data, won/loss records and spreadsheets. Athletics are our classroom, where we have the opportunity and responsibility to teach lessons that transcend to the field. So when a student-athlete steps forward and asks us to "let me play," we need to hear "I want to learn more." Educators don't marginalize their students' enthusiasm to be consistent. Instead, we embrace their enthusiasm with hope and optimism, that our work is focused, principle-centered and honorable. Thank you. (Applause.)

Linda Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): Yesterday, during our discussions about the future of Division III, we heard speaker after speaker articulate support for staying together as a division. While the suggestion and the articulation of our position as a division was very important, we now need to prioritize those issues that create the greatest distance among our institutions at the extreme ends of our philosophical spectrum and find reasonable—not perfect, but reasonable—compromise. If we can reach a reasonable compromise in certain areas, our institutions at the extreme ends of the philosophical spectrum can better utilize our conference structures to further accommodate their conference needs.

Our conference supports 41 and 41-1, not because we believe it's perfect legislation or that it adequately addresses what we believe needs to be the recognition and acceptance of sport differences, but as a conference we believe the intent to take steps toward sanity in Division III warrants support. (Applause.)

Dennis Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): I rise in favor of Proposals 41 and 41-1. Our conference members support this proposal by an overwhelming majority because we like the principle-based decisions made by the committee. For us, the cuts in contests and weeks, though a double-edged sword, address a key concern at our institutions. If you look at those team sports identified for reduction, their contests missed class time during midweek. Men's and women's soccer, field hockey, volleyball, baseball and softball are the ones that miss midweek classes and disrupt the academic enterprise. Football and cross country, for example, were not cut because they are basically played on Saturday only.

With careful reduction in our nontraditional seasons two years ago, with an outstanding package and way the membership came together, this is a natural progression for us. Is this a perfect package? No. Do we like every part of it? No. Will we vote for it? Yes. We will vote for it because on the whole it applies sound principles to the operation of our Division III sports and enterprise and we embrace that. We would hope that all of us in Division III can rally around this because as we heard yesterday, we all have the same philosophy and this helps us give definition to our philosophy. We urge your support.

Erika Proko (Washington and Lee University): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly opposes Proposal No. 41-1. The decrease in the number of weeks in the playing and practice seasons adversely affects the preseason conditioning needs of specific

sports. As a result, this can encourage the likelihood of unsupervised captains practices and increase the risk of injury. With the weekly limitations as proposed, student-athletes will not have the opportunity to further develop the proper fundamental skills and mechanics that only come with sufficient preseason practice.

For example, a baseball or softball pitcher needs time with the coach to address proper techniques and mechanics in order to prepare for the season without injury. A swimmer is subject to a training-intensive sport that requires a long and gradual buildup of aerobic capacity prior to the first athletic contest. Historically, the weeks leading up to the first contest are devoted to the specific needs of each sport in order to physically repair the body for competition. With a reduction of permissible weeks in the playing and practice season, student-athletes will be adversely affected, as they will be placed in competition without the proper training for their sport. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to oppose Proposal No. 41-1.

Mr. Walker: Thank you. The chair might remind the membership that 41-1 focuses on weeks in golf and tennis participation in the fall. Forty-one focuses on contest limits. At this time, we're talking about 41-1. Any further discussion or comments on 41-1? Seeing none, we're now prepared to vote on Proposition 41-1. This will be a roll-call vote.

[Proposal No. 41-1 was adopted, 184-179-2.]

We now return to Proposition 41 as amended by 41-1. Is there discussion?

Dennis Leighton (University of New England): I'm chair of the Legislative Review Committee for the Faculty Athletic Reps Association. Faculty recognize and support the benefits of the student-athlete experience as an integral part of the educational process. Certainly, the concept that, for many student-athletes, academic performance improves during the season, when the student-athlete is forced to exercise time management, is readily apparent. However, limits must be set. The Faculty Athletic Reps Association supports this legislation as an equitable and reasonable model to set appropriate limits of expectations placed on student-athletes.

The Faculty Athletic Reps Association feels that one of the primary issues facing Division III student-athletes and institutions is missed class time. While this legislation will result in a decrease in contests for only 10 out of the 35 teams involved, the Faculty Athletic Reps Association does feel that this will help decrease missed class time by student-athletes. When scrimmage opportunities are considered, most of the 35 teams gain opportunities to play against outside competition. However, this is less of a concern because class time cannot be missed for scrimmages. The advantages of Proposal 41 as amended outweigh the disadvantages, and the Faculty Athletic Reps Association urges your support.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I think there has been reasonable compromise. We have legislated back some issues regarding nontraditional seasons and also weeks of competition. If you believe that 41-1 and 41 is good philosophy, you have the chance to enact it. You can decide at your institution, among your president, faculty athletics rep, admissions office, athletics director, etc., to enact all of 41 on your individual campus, either through conference legislation or selection of nonconference and independent opportunities for competition during the year.

I think our student-athletes deserve better than we may be giving them. Many of our student-athletes do already write for the newspaper during their seasons, they are involved in plays, they do other things. It is not a situation where student-athletes on our campus are forced to choose between academics and athletics only and all other extracurricular activities possible. In my case, my daughter does many other things during the tennis season besides go to class and go to tennis practice or competitions. I think it's clear that our student-athletes can make adult choices for themselves. We hear in this venue a lot that student-athletes can't make good choices or that they only want more. I think we short-

change our student-athletes as young adults and being able to control their own destiny. I urge you to defeat 41 as amended.

Ira Zeff (Nebraska Wesleyan University): I would like to move to divide out the competition limitations portion of 41-D, 41-G and Appendix B.

Mr. Walker: Ira, with all due respect to the maker, the chair rules that motion out of order. This proposal is intended as a legislative package. That package intentionally links a reduction in the length of the playing season with limited contest reductions and an increase in scrimmage opportunities. Permitting this proposal to be divided would be inconsistent with that intent. Dividing the proposal for separate votes would defeat the intent that the legislative proposals be adopted or defeated as a package. Although the proposal contains multiple sections, that was done to reflect the multiple portions of the proposal, not to permit separate votes on those provisions. Permitting some portions to be adopted and others defeated would be inconsistent with the sponsor's intent.

This certainly is a close call, but when in doubt, the intent of the sponsors must govern such parliamentary rulings.

Mr. Zeff: With all due respect, I would like to move to challenge the chair's ruling. I think that there's a lot of very, very valuable parts of the proposal, but I think the limitations, as we've heard discussion this morning and this afternoon, are a very important part of this proposal that need to be separated out to be a separate vote.

Mr. Walker: Is there a second? Okay. This is a debatable motion. Each speaker is limited to one comment. The actual vote will be: Should the chair's ruling be upheld? It takes a majority "no" vote to overrule the chair's ruling. Discussion? Ira, go ahead.

Mr. Zeff: As I stated earlier this morning on behalf of the independents, I think that access to championships is very important. The limitation of contests certainly hurts the independents as they will have problems finding in-region games as conferences will limit their nonconference schedules. It also will hurt the conferences that choose not to have postseason conference championships as they will be limited by the contest limitations and it can hurt their selection process as well. I think that we're restricting this to certain people that are not going to be positively affected by limiting these limitations.

In the fall session of this proposal, the sports do have 10 weeks. If we go by the two contests per week, it does allow us to have up to 20 contests during that time period. The independents, the conferences that choose not to have their conference tournaments at the end of the season, would not be allowed to use the full 20 contests or the 18 contests that is proposed here or two contests per week. I urge you to follow through and help to allow us to divide this out and see how the membership feels. Thank you.

John McCardell (Middlebury College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I encourage the delegates to sustain the chair's ruling. Permitting division of this proposal would fly, as the chair has already indicated, squarely in the face of its intent. Permitting separate votes by sport would be contrary to the basic intent and philosophy of the proposal, which is that sports in each season should have similar playing seasons and corresponding contest limits.

Division of the proposal will likely result in, even if it does not directly intend, the failure of the proposal. Those who oppose the motion should vote against the motion, Proposal 41. Those who support Proposal 41 but support it only if amended risk bringing about its death in spirit, if not in substance, by a thousand knicks. In some sports reducing the length of the season without the corresponding reduction in contest limits would result in the same number of contests during fewer weeks. Arguably, this is worse than the status quo. The proposal is intended as a legislative package and should be voted up or down on those merits and in that manner. I urge that the chair's ruling be upheld. Thank you.

[Support to sustain the chair's ruling was approved, 289-67-6.]

Lisa Melendy (Williams College): Proposal 41 provides a philosophic foundation for deciding the appropriate number of contests and weeks of practice that was previously lacking. The question is how much is enough? I think Proposal 41 begins to provide a framework within which to answer this question and provides an appropriate sense of balance to students' academic and athletic lives. I urge you to support Proposal 41.

[Proposal No. 41 was defeated, 166-196-6.]

**EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS—
SELECTION OF TEAMS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION—
AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION**

Susan Bassett (William Smith College): On behalf of the Presidents and Management Councils and the Championships Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

As discussed in this morning's session, Proposal No. 42 is designed to provide equitable team-sport championship access for conference automatic qualification in Pool A, independent non-AQ conference members in Pool B; and Pool A and Pool B member schools that were not previously selected in Pool C. Most importantly, the proposal applies a consistent bracket ratio for all team sports. This proposal includes a delayed effective date to 2005 to permit time to address issues related to implementation and funding. This proposal directly and effectively addresses legislative mandate approved by the membership during last year's Convention for team sport AQ enhancement. It represents the culmination of approximately two years of work by the Championships Committee. I urge your support. Thank you.

Ivory Nelson [Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)]: As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I also speak to support Proposal No. 42. Proposal No. 43 does not fit in with the initial AQ principles previously adopted by the membership. The initial goal was to provide a 1:7.5 access ratio for team sports. We now propose a ratio of 1:6.5 across the board. Proposal No. 43 emphasizes conference access, which inherently treats larger brackets differently from smaller brackets. Bracket size access ratios under that proposal could differ from 1:6.2 to 1:7.25. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to support Proposal No. 42.

Bill Eng (Bernard M. Baruch College): As a member of the Division III Management Council and Division III Championships Committee, I speak in support of Proposal No. 42. Proposal 43 does not treat all sports equitably. Ending ratios for championship brackets are not consistent for all sports. For example, women's lacrosse, the ratio would be 1:7.25, and 1.6 for men's lacrosse. The end bracket size is dependent on the number of Pool A slots in each sport. On behalf of the Management Council and Championships Committee, I encourage you to vote yes for Proposal No. 42. Thank you.

Dick Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): When the current championship selection process and automatic qualification for all conference championships was adopted several years ago, it was done as a zero sum change. We increased the number of conference champions and fields but we did not increase overall field sizes in a comparable manner. As a result, significant numbers of at-large berths were lost. An unintended consequence of this has been the ratcheting up of the intensity of competition during the regular season and a profile of conference alignments and conference competition that in many cases is very different today than it was several years ago, and not necessarily for the better.

Proposals 42 and 43 have both been termed championship expansion. I would suggest that what they really constitute is championship right-sizing. The principle problem in the

current system is a lack of Pool C berths. This is caused by two factors, as we noted this morning: the overall field sizes that are too small in all sports and the large number of automatic qualifying conferences in some sports. Both Proposals 42 and 43 address these issues, although by different means.

Both provide significantly greater numbers of championship berths. As I noted this morning, 81 more berths than we currently have under both models. Also as I noted this morning, both provide similar numbers of additional berths for men and for women. Proposal 42 provides 49 of 81 new berths it generates for women's sports, while Proposal 43 provides 45 of the 81 new berths it generates to women's teams. This is important and much needed legislation. While the members of our Association would prefer the adoption of Proposal 43, we recognize that Proposal 42 also meets the needs of the membership and the needs of our student-athletes and achieves many if not all of the same ends. On that basis, I urge your support of Proposal 42 and urge its adoption by as large a majority of our membership as possible.

Dan DiBiasio (Wilmington College, Ohio): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I also speak in support of Proposal No. 42. This proposal treats all sports equitably by applying a consistent bracket ratio to all championships. As discussed this morning, a consistent 1:6.5 ratio creates the smaller brackets, which have fewer Pool A berths, and larger brackets more consistently. This equitable approach seems most appropriate for Division III. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I also encourage you to vote yes for Proposal No. 42.

Joshua Espinosa (Buena Vista University): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly urges you to support Proposal No. 42. The essence of this proposal directly coincides with the Division III philosophy by increasing access of the national championships. With the increases in Pools B and C, all student-athletes will be given additional opportunities to compete on the national level. The 1:6.5 ratio provides a consistent formula that allows for growth in the division. At the request of the membership, the Championships Committee has successfully constructed this model. Thus, we encourage your support of Proposal No. 42.

Stan Caine (Adrian College): I rise to express a concern about the further expansion of the championships aspect of Division III and especially the additional use of resources for that purpose. I do this with a great deal of reluctance because I have admiration for what the Championships Committee has done and realize the painstaking work that's been done. Until this very moment, Dick Rasmussen has been a good friend of mine. I don't know whether that will continue or not. (Laughter.)

But I call your attention to Ced Dempsey's comment the other night, that his great concern about Division III was that we were becoming more and more preoccupied with championships. I also call your attention this morning to the wonderful presentation that we heard with regard to the way that the initiatives money had been used for a variety of very useful purposes. This proposal as funded will cost us over a million dollars, it looks like between a million two and a million three. I would rather use that money to provide opportunities for the entire membership through the initiatives process and other such things rather than using an additional large amount of the money available for the expansion of championships.

Ed Streb (Rowan University): I'm Rowan University's faculty athletics representative. I'm also the president of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association. At our fall forum this past November, a number of people expressed concerns similar to the previous speaker. Ced Dempsey himself was there and expressed concern about the emphasis or perhaps overemphasis on championship play at Division III. Several people expressed concerns about increasing the bracket size of Division III as well. However, as faculty athletics rep-

resentatives, we also recognize the intangible benefits of championship opportunities and the learning experiences provided by national competition. We therefore urge your support of Proposition 42. We think it's a more reasonable approach to expanding championship brackets than Proposition 43, which we oppose. Thank you.

Jim Nelson (Suffolk University): Last year I did not have the good fortune of attending our annual Convention, and a number of colleagues expressed disappointment that their favorite Don was not in Indianapolis. (Laughter.) For those of you unfamiliar with the Don legacy, I have appeared before the body previously as Don Quixote and Don Corleone, hoping that those mythical figures would enhance passage of certain legislation.

Just before leaving for the Convention, my wife asked me, "Which Don are you going to be this year?" I said that this year I was going to be Don Juan. (Laughter.) She looked at me and she laughed and she laughed and she laughed. (Laughter.) I did remind her that we did have five children. (Laughter.) And she gave me that other look that said don't even think about it. (Laughter.) Oh, well.

Moving on to my second favorite subject, the first being my granddaughters, my second favorite topic being bracket expansion. Since 1999, when automatic qualification entered our lives, a concern for exceptional teams and their student-athletes denied the opportunity to fulfill their goals and aspirations has been debated. Some would contend that we are in a malaise of overemphasis regarding championships. But let me note that at last evening's Honors Dinner, we witnessed with our recognition of today's Top VIII and Silver Anniversary honorees what champions can produce and, yes, I wept with all of you throughout the comments of Amanda Walton, what a real champion represents in all of our lives.

My thanks to the Management Council and the UAA for their proposals, for each moves forward bracket expansion. I will cast one symbolic vote of "no" for Proposition 42 for the work that UAA and Dick Rasmussen—as many times as his name was mispronounced today—for the work that they have done in moving us forward. I feel that the UAA has been a strong supporter of bracket expansion, and their proposal last year helped to move our Management Council forward in bringing their proposal.

So having stated all of that, whether you wish to have a conversation with Don Quixote, Don Corleone, or just want some advice from Don Juan, I will be around the lobby. Thank you. (Applause.)

Richard Berman (Manhattanville College): I, too, ask for your consideration—not only for support of this item based on the facts that you've heard today—I won't repeat them—about the merit and the unfortunate flaw in 43, which would send an unfortunate signal about what we think about women and women student-athletes. We have an ability here at this time to all come together and support 42. We've heard from the student-athletes; we've heard from the faculty; we've heard from the Management Council; we've heard from the Presidents Council. Now we have an opportunity as a division, Division III, to come together and unanimously support No. 42.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): With all due respect, I don't believe that the differences between 42 or 43 has a thing to do about gender. (Applause.) Both proposals do what we've asked them to do. That is increase opportunities in Pool C. Both deserve credit for doing that. However, I believe that 43 provides greater access to those sports where the greatest percentage of our membership participates. And it clearly does that. I urge you to support 43.

[Proposal No. 42 was adopted, 306-59-3.]

Mr. Walker: That concludes this afternoon's Presidents Council grouping. Thank you for your attention and cooperation. We now take a brief 15-minute break. Immediately following the break, we will open the window to reconsider any of three proposals voted earlier this afternoon. We're taking the break, by the way, so the posted votes are outside and

you can make sure that your vote was recorded accurately. They'll be posted on the bulletin boards immediately outside the room. Please return promptly at 2:25.

Mr. Walker: Thank you for returning. I could entertain a question, but I understand there's some confusion among the delegates over what exactly happened on 41 and 41-1. So let me ask Dan Dutcher, our expert, to exactly report to you what happened.

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): Thank you. We've heard a lot of confusion regarding what happened with Proposal 41 and 41-1. Under the way we adopt legislation, we have proposals and then we have amendments to those proposals or amendments-to-amendments. Proposal 41 was the base proposal; 41-1 was an amendment to that proposal. When 41-1 was adopted, that incorporated certain legislative changes into Proposal 41 itself. So first, you voted to adopt 41-1. What that did was change Proposal 41 in the way it's indicated under 41-1.

It's still necessary—and this is a typical item of confusion, unfortunately—then to vote on the original Proposal 41 as it was amended by the amendment-to-amendment we adopted, which was 41-1. So when 41 itself, as it had been amended, was considered, it was defeated. So at this point, Proposal 41 as it was amended by 41-1 has not been adopted. As far as reconsideration goes, Chris is going to go ahead and review those provisions.

Mr. Walker: All right. The window of reconsideration is now open for Proposals 41 through 43. As a reminder, a proposal to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side of the last vote. Any voting delegate can second that motion. Reconsideration would then occur by majority vote. Finally, any reconsideration will require a roll-call vote, since Proposal Nos. 41 through 43 were also roll-call votes. Is there a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that we handled before the break, that would be Proposal Nos. 41 through 43, from someone who voted on the prevailing side?

Tracey Short (Wesley College): I'd like to call for reconsideration on 41. There was a misunderstanding.

Mr. Walker: You voted on the prevailing side of 41?

Mr. Short: Correct.

Mr. Walker: Which was to defeat it.

Mr. Short: Yes.

Mr. Walker: Is there a second? Second. Thank you. Again, this is a debatable motion. It takes a majority vote to reconsider. We're open for discussion.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I've been on the prevailing side and the losing side in very close votes. I think we all know how the amendment procedure works. We vote, sometimes we like the result, sometimes we don't like the result. We voted. We spoke. The result should be there. I would urge the membership to vote against reconsideration of 41. (Applause.)

Marcia Kierscht (Stephens College): I'm president of Stephens College, an independent college, and a member of the Management Council. I'd like to clarify that the group saying that they represent the independent institutions of Division III represent probably less than a third of the truly independent institutions in Division III. I would like to speak as a president of a truly independent institution for Proposition 41. (Applause.)

Lynn Rothenhoefer (Rosemont College): To go back to the reconsideration and to really point out a word that I have seen or heard: growth. Some of us are not so old to the amendment procedure and clarification needed to be done. There was a lot of confusion where I'm sitting. I went out into the hallway; there was a lot of confusion there. I saw some faces that really didn't understand what had just happened. I appreciate the reconsideration and I would urge 41 as well.

Mr. Walker: Okay, I believe we're ready for a vote. You're voting to reconsider Proposition 41 as amended by 41-1.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal 41 was defeated, 165-195-4.]

Is there any additional reconsideration of motions before we move on? If not, the motion for reconsideration for Proposals 41 through 43 is now closed. That concludes our roll-call voting for today. Thank you.

We can vote on the rest of the propositions by paddle. However, please keep your voting units handy; we can use them if any of the paddle votes appear too close to call.

AMATEURISM—PROFESSIONAL TEAM—DEFINITION

Les Poolman (Dickinson College): On behalf of the Amateurism Task Force, I'd like to move Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal amends the current definition of *professional team*, which is antiquated and too complex. The current definition of a professional team in the NCAA Manual uses the word *professional* seven times. This proposal is in the spirit of deregulation and is aligned with the Division III philosophy to simplify the rules. For student-athletes who trigger full-time enrollment at an international collegiate institution, this proposal will ensure consistency in assessing their competitive experiences. Furthermore, it just makes sense to label a team as a professional if it pays its players.

The new definition will bring greater consistency in the application of NCAA rules to domestic and international student-athletes. Division I has already adopted the recommended definition and the Division II Amateurism Project Team has recommended the same definition. In this instance, consistency across divisions would benefit the Association. Thank you for your support of this.

[Proposal No. 44 was adopted.]

RECRUITING—DEFINITION OF CONTACT

Sandra Slabik (Neumann College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, Management Council and Interpretations and Legislation Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

The term contact is a common word used in NCAA legislation to describe an encounter or a meeting between at least two individuals. However, this term is not defined in Division III legislation. The definition of a contact as used in Divisions I and II was adopted in 1980. However, Division III never considered such a proposal. No comparable legislation has been proposed since that time. It appears to be a mere oversight that such legislation never was considered in Division III. I also want to note that the legislative interpretation, which specifies that this legislation will not impact contacts made by nonathletics staff, such as admissions officers. For these reasons I urge your support for Proposal No. 45. Thank you.

Mr. Walker: Let me make clear. The Management Council has approved an official interpretation regarding this proposal, which specifies that it only applies to contacts by athletics staff members. I believe you received an interpretation that's on the Powerpoint.

[Proposal No. 45 was adopted.]

RECRUITING—ELIGIBILITY RAMIFICATIONS— RESTITUTION FOR IMPROPER BENEFITS

Connee Zotos (Drew University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to move Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

The proposed legislative change would positively reduce the number of improper benefits cases processed by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and NCAA staff in which the improper benefit received is no more than \$50 in value. The reinstatement condition in such cases will remain restitution. Documentation of the individual's repayment to a charity of his or her choice must be forwarded to the enforcement staff for institutional violation purposes. Passage of this proposal will reinforce the previously defined focus on the dollar value of improper benefits and required restitution while obviating the need to process those cases in which the value of the improper benefit is minimal. I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 46 was adopted.]

RECRUITING—DE MINIMUS VIOLATIONS

Chad Yowell (Wheaton College, Massachusetts): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to move Proposition No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

The proposed legislative change would positively reduce the number of recruiting violation cases the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and the NCAA staff process without compromising the original intent of the legislation or the possible eligibility ramifications of any individual prospective student-athlete. When violations of these recruiting bylaws occur, the prospective student-athletes have little or no culpability; therefore, violations do not contain reinstatement conditions or penalties. Essentially, the entire act of requesting reinstatement becomes an unnecessary exercise. I strongly urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 47 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY—SEASON OF COMPETITION—WAIVER

Karen Johnson (Alfred University): On behalf of the Administrative Review Subcommittee, I would like to move Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Administrative Review Subcommittee and the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee both support this proposal. It would expand the current seasons-of-competition rule to include eligible student-athletes. Currently, if a student-athlete competes in limited competition and is unable to complete the remainder of the season due to circumstances beyond the control of the student-athlete and the institution, an institution would file a minimum-amount-of-competition waiver with the Administrative Review Subcommittee. Based on the increasing number of waiver requests regarding the use of a season, the Administrative Review Subcommittee has determined that authority for granting the waiver should rest with the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. Further, the waiver would establish specific circumstances beyond the control of the student-athlete or the institution where it seems appropriate that a student-athlete should not be charged with a season for the limited competition.

Specifically, the circumstances outlined in the waiver include a student-athlete who withdraws from an NCAA institution as a result of life-threatening illness or injury suffered by a member of the student's immediate family; the student-athlete withdraws from the institution as a result of extreme financial difficulties experienced by the student-athlete or an individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent; or the student-athlete's institution dropped the sport during the season after the student-athlete had participated.

Finally, if a waiver is granted, the student-athlete will be withheld one regularly sched-

uled contest for each contest that he or she competed in which had triggered the use of a season. On behalf of ARS, I encourage your support for this proposal. Thank you.

Tom Bohlsen (Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference): Just a point of clarification. Would this be handled the same way as hardship waivers and the conference would determine this matter? Who will determine these?

Mwensi Ekpo (NCAA Staff): To answer your question, it would be handled by student-athlete reinstatement, similar to the waiver that currently exists in Bylaw 14.2.6 for students who compete while ineligible. The contest limitations are the same, though, as currently apply for hardship waivers. It would be three contests or one-third of the completed schedule.

[Proposal No. 48 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS— NONCOLLEGIATE AMATEUR COMPETITION—BASKETBALL

Connee Zotos (Drew University): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow basketball student-athletes to be treated similarly to student-athletes in other sports and students generally. In the spirit of student-athlete welfare and the Division III philosophy, basketball student-athletes should have the opportunity to participate in outside competition without penalty as long as such competition occurs outside of the institution's basketball season. For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 49 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—NUMBER OF CONTESTS—ICE HOCKEY

Steve Argo (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would make the maximum number of contests in women's ice hockey consistent with that of men's ice hockey. The current women's limit is based upon the fact that the sport was a national collegiate sport for all divisions and reflects a Division I contest limit. However, Division III now sponsors its own championship for women's ice hockey. Therefore, the limit should be consistent with that of men's ice hockey. For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 50 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—TENNIS—PRESEASON PRACTICE

Bob Malekoff (College of Wooster): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Division III Presidents Council, Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee support the adoption of Proposal No. 51. This proposal would treat tennis at those institutions that conduct their traditional seasons in the fall in a manner consistent with other fall sports. In this regard, tennis student-athletes will be afforded sufficient time for skill development and conditioning before intercollegiate competition begins.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 51 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS— INDOOR AND OUTDOOR TRACK AND FIELD—LENGTH OF PLAYING SEASON

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, Management Council and the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would specify that an institution that sponsors either indoor or outdoor track and field, but not both, is limited to a playing and practice season of 21 weeks. Under current legislation, an institution that conducts both indoor and outdoor track and field is permitted to conduct a playing and practice season of 26 weeks. For an institution that sponsors one sport but not the other, there is no current legislation that limits the playing and practice season to anything less than 26 weeks. This proposal would simply limit such an institution to a 20-week playing and practice season, and the institution that sponsors both sports would still be permitted to participate in the current 26-week playing and practice season. Please note that if Proposal No. 41 or 41-1 would have been adopted, the length of the playing seasons for track and field would have been adjusted accordingly. Since that was defeated, this legislation still is necessary.

[Proposal No. 52 was adopted.]

Dee Fairchild (Grinnell College): I have a point of information or a question on the tennis proposal. Am I correct in assuming that those schools, those of us who have women's golf in the fall, still start August 24?

Mwени Ekpo (NCAA Staff): This proposal does nothing to change golf.

Ms. Fairchild: Thank you.

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CHAMPIONSHIPS—WOMEN'S BOWLING

Susan Bassett (William Smith College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

In an effort to increase championship opportunities for women, the Association's governance structure proposes the establishment of a National Collegiate Championship in women's bowling. Currently, 42 institutions sponsor the sport of women's bowling. There are 26 Division I, 14 Division II and two in Division III. The establishment of a women's bowling championship necessitates the development of a committee with playing rules and championship administration responsibilities. Please note that the composition of the proposed sports committee will closely reflect the sports sponsorship data. This sport is growing in popularity at the collegiate level. Establishing a championship would benefit all three divisions in the long run. On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee, I urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 53. Thank you.

Mr. Walker: Note that Susan indicated the Presidents Council is sponsoring this proposal. They were inadvertently left off the sponsorship line.

[Proposal No. 53 was adopted.]

MEMBERSHIP—EMERGING SPORTS—RUGBY

Susan Bassett (William Smith College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, Management Council and the Committee on Women's Athletics, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal adds rugby to the list of emerging sports for women. The committee and councils agree that information has been submitted which demonstrates that rugby has met the criteria for consideration as an emerging sport. Letters of support have been submitted from numerous member institutions. The addition of rugby to the list of emerging sports will not only provide additional participation opportunities for women, but will continue efforts to assist institutions in addressing gender-equity issues. For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 54 was adopted.]

Mr. Walker: Thank you for your attention and cooperation with the last 11 proposals. We'll now open the window of reconsideration for these proposals. As a reminder, a motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side during the last vote. Any voting delegate can second the motion. Reconsideration then occurs by majority vote. Is there a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that we handled after the break? That would be Proposal Nos. 44 through 54, from someone who voted on the prevailing side. If not, the window of reconsideration is now closed and we have concluded our legislative voting. (Applause.)

That concludes this afternoon's formal legislative agenda. Permit me to take a point of personal privilege very briefly. As I complete my service as chair of the Management Council this year, let me say it has been both an honor and a privilege to work with the Presidents Council and the fine leadership of Bette Landman. All I can say is she's the best. And also the fine professionals that you would be very proud of, the members that make up the Management Council and the hard work that they do. Finally, it's been a privilege to get to know so many of you that I simply did not have an opportunity to interact with before. Let me also say that working with the NCAA staff has been indeed a pleasure. Dan and Bridget lead a great team of individuals who provide outstanding leadership and support of our division.

Finally, I wish Susan Bassett and Suzanne Coffey, our leadership for the Management Council next year, the best of luck as they now assume that mantle of leadership. Thank you all for your attention. Let me turn the gavel back to president Bette Landman. (Applause.) Hang on one second.

Susan Bassett (William Smith College): Mr. Chair, prior to our adjournment, I ask the membership to join with me in thanking you for the superior leadership you've provided this last year. Chris has worked tirelessly on our behalf. He has provided thorough preparation for all of our meetings. He's done an outstanding job in representing the interests of Division III to both the Executive Committee and this past year in the very important presidential search process. So I ask the membership to join me in thanking Chris Walker for his year of service. (Standing ovation.)

Ms. Landman: At the risk of saying "me too," I, too, would like to add my congratulations to Chris. I indicated before that he is really a superb member and representative of NCAA Division III. You recall when you saw the program for SAAC leadership, that you saw Chris there. That was indicative of the kind of commitment he made not only to do the job as it was described, but to make sure that he reached out to other groups that were functioning so that he came to fully understand the issues, the concerns and to give his support to those things that we truly treasure and value.

He was always prepared. You just needed to see these little orange things all over his papers and the markers and the pens and so forth. He just put me to shame because he was so prepared for everything that happened. And I, too, want to add my congratulations to Chris and also to the individuals who will be taking over the leadership of the management. You're going to have some big shoes to fill.

John McCardell (Middlebury College): I would like to introduce the following resolution, ask that it be entered upon the records of the division and subscribed to by acclamation. It reads as follows:

"Whereas, Bette Landman will conclude her one-year term as chair of the NCAA Division III Presidents Council at the conclusion of the 2003 Convention; and whereas Bette Landman has made significant contributions to the Division III Presidents Council, Executive Committee, and the NCAA Division III membership; and whereas Bette Landman has served as chair of the Division III Presidents Council and in that capacity chair of the Administrative Committee and a member of the NCAA Executive Committee and has provided leadership and vision to the Division III membership on issues related to the future of the division and has demonstrated her commitment to student-athlete welfare; and whereas Bette Landman has represented Division III on Association-wide matters, including the Executive Committee, Budget Committee, the Executive Committee's subcommittee on gender and diversity, serving as chair, and the hiring of the new NCAA president and decisions regarding the NCAA; now, therefore be it resolved that the Division III membership wishes to express its deep appreciation to Bette Landman for her hard work, her passion, her dedication to the success and to the future of Division III." (Standing ovation.)

Ms. Landman: Thank you. It's always embarrassing to hear all these things when you know you have feet of clay. But I thank you very much. It really has been a privilege to serve all of you about an issue that we care most deeply. And that is our students. And I wish you and the new leadership, John McCardell, Kevin LaGree, and all of you who will be moving in and out of the various committees of the NCAA, the very best as you move forward.

Are there other topics of interest that the delegates would like to discuss at this time? Seeing none, we are adjourned. I wish you the very best as the year progresses. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

[The meeting was adjourned at 3:11 p.m.]

97th Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 2002-03 NCAA Divisions II and III Manuals.]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 97th ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 39	Division II Legislative Proposals
1 through 6	Consent Package
7 through 29	Presidents Council Grouping
30 through 32	Recruiting
33	Financial Aid
34 through 38	Playing and Practice Seasons
39	General
40 through 54	Division III Legislative Proposals
40 through 43	Presidents Council Grouping
44 through 54	General

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division II Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division II athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division II chief executive officers.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division II Management Council or by Division II committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division II Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division II.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division II Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.12, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

CONSENT PACKAGE

NO. 1 (NO. 2-6) RECRUITING — DE MINIMUS VIOLATIONS

Intent: To specify that violations of Bylaw 13.4.3 (conference restrictions), 13.4.4.2 (NCAA or conference championship posters), 13.7.5.5.2 (multiple hosts), 13.7.5.5.3 (nonqualifier probation), 13.7.5.5.4 (use of automobile), 13.11.6 (photograph of prospects) and 13.14.1 (coach involvement) are de minimus in nature.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.4.3, Page 85, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.4.3 Conference Restrictions. A member conference is precluded from providing recruiting materials to prospects. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered conference violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**”

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.4.4.2, Page 85, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.4.4.2 NCAA or Conference Championship Posters. An institution hosting an NCAA or conference championship may produce a poster promoting the championship and send it to a high-school coach and/or his or her educational institution. It is not permissible to send such a poster to a prospect. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**”

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.5.2, Page 89, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.7.5.5.2 Multiple Hosts. If several students host a prospect, the \$30 per day entertainment money may be used to cover the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the prospect and all hosts. Only one student host per prospect may be provided a free meal, if restaurant facilities are used. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**”

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.5.3, Page 89, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.7.5.5.3 Nonqualifier Prohibition. The student host must be enrolled in the member institution being visited by a prospect. A nonqualifier (see Bylaw 14.02.9) may not serve as a student host during his or her first academic year in residence. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete’s eligibility.”**

E. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.5.4, Page 89, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.7.5.5.4 Use of Automobile. The institution or representatives of its athletics interests shall not provide an automobile for use by the prospect or the student host. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete’s eligibility.”**

F. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.6, Page 93, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.11.6 Photograph of Prospect. It is permissible for an institution to photograph a prospect during a campus visit to be used in the institution’s permissible publicity and promotional activities (e.g., press release, media guide), but the photograph may not be given to the prospect. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete’s eligibility.”**

G. Bylaws: Amend 13.14.1, Page 99, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.14.1 Coach Involvement. A member institution shall not permit any coach or athletics department staff member directly involved in the recruiting of student-athletes to participate (directly or indirectly) in the management, coaching, officiating, supervision, promotion or player selection of any all-star team or contest involving interscholastic players or **for** those who, during the previous school year, were members of high-school athletics teams. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete’s eligibility.”**

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: In reviewing reinstatement cases, no penalty has been imposed on prospective student-athletes involved in violations of these bylaws. In addition, the prospective student-athletes have little or no culpability in such violations. Amending these bylaws

to incorporate the de minimus clause is in the spirit of deregulation and will continue to reduce the number of cases processed by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and NCAA staff.

Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 2 (NO. 2-7) RECRUITING — ELIGIBILITY
RAMIFICATIONS — RESTITUTION FOR
IMPROPER BENEFITS**

Intent: To specify circumstances in which an institution does not have to declare ineligible and seek restoration on behalf of a prospective student-athlete who received an improper benefit while a prospect, provided the individual repays the value of the benefit.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.5 by adding new 13.5.7, Page 85, as follows:
[Division II]

“13.5 ENTERTAINMENT

[13.5.1 through 13.5.6 unchanged.]

“13.5.7 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of Bylaw 13.5 in which the value of the entertainment is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.8 by adding new 13.7.5.8.1, Page 90, as follows:
[Division II]

“13.7.5.8 Normal Retail Cost. If a boat, snowmobile, recreational vehicle or similar recreational equipment (including those provided by an institutional staff member or a representative of the institution's athletics interests) is used to entertain a prospect or the prospect's parents, legal guardian(s) and spouse, the normal retail cost of the use of such equipment shall be assessed against the \$30-per-day entertainment figure; further, if such normal retail cost exceeds the \$30-per-day entertainment allowance, such entertainment may not be provided.

“13.7.5.8.1 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of Bylaw 13.7.5.8 in which the value of the entertainment in excess of the \$30-per-day entertainment figure is \$50 or less, the

eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.”

C. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.7 by adding new 13.7.7.1, Page 90, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.7.7 Lodging for Additional Persons. Additional persons (e.g., prospect’s brother, sister, friend) may stay in the same room as the prospect or parents, spouse or legal guardian(s) of the prospect, but the institution shall not pay the costs resulting from the additional occupants. The additional occupants shall not be prospects being recruited by the institution.

“13.7.7.1 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution of Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of Bylaw 13.7.7 in which the value of the lodging for additional persons is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual’s repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.”

D. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.13.2.1 by adding new 13.13.2.1.1.5, Page 98, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.13.2.1 Student-Athletes

[13.13.2.1.1 unchanged.]

[13.13.2.1.1.1 through 13.13.2.1.1.4 unchanged.]

“13.13.2.1.1.5 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of Bylaw 13.13.2.1.1 in which the value of the excessive compensation is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the im-

permissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.”

[13.13.2.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Presently, the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee reviews violations filed in regard to these bylaws. A review of the determinations made in such cases revealed that most if not all required repayment. In addition, violations of the stated bylaws involve situations where the prospective student-athlete had little or no culpability. Therefore, amending the bylaws to incorporate the restitution clause furthers the spirit of deregulation and will facilitate the reduction of cases required to be processed by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and NCAA staff.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 3 (NO. 2-8)	RECRUITING — MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS — DURING CAMPUS VISIT
------------------------	--

Intent: To specify that results of a medical examination conducted by an institution during a prospect's official or unofficial visit may not be used to determine the admission of the prospect.

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.6.1, Page 95, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.12.2.6.1 During Campus Visit. During a prospect's official or unofficial visit to campus, a member institution, through its regular team or other designated physician, may conduct a medical examination to determine the prospect's medical qualifications to participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided no athletics department staff member other than the trainer is present, *and* the examination does not include any test or procedure designed to measure the athletics agility or skill of the prospect **and the results of the examination are not used by the institution to determine the admission of the prospect.”**

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) prohibits a college or university to refuse admittance to a prospective student or otherwise discriminate in the admission of or the recruitment of the

prospective student-athlete, solely because of a physical or mental disability if the student is otherwise qualified for admission. The medical exam, conducted by a member institution during a prospect's official or unofficial visit to determine preexisting injuries or illnesses would not be a violation of the ADA, provided the purpose of the exam is not to determine a disability, as defined above, but rather to determine injury or illness that does not substantially limit a major life activity of the student-athlete and the results of the exam are not shared with the admissions office, so they can be used in consideration for determination of the prospective student-athlete's admission, should a disability, rather than an injury or illness, be discovered during the course of the examination.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 4 (NO. 2-13) ELIGIBILITY — HARDSHIP WAIVER — ADMINISTRATION

Intent: To permit institutions to appeal a conference denial of a hardship waiver to the NCAA Division II Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5.1, Page 115, as follows:

[Division II]

“14.2.5.1 Administration of Hardship Waiver. The hardship waiver shall be administered by the member conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. **An institution may appeal a decision by its conference to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee.”**

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003, for any hardship waiver denied on or after February 1, 2000.

Rationale: Previously, the Administrative Review Subcommittee (ARS) reviewed appeals of the normal application of the hardship waiver if the legislated conditions were not met and the conference office denied the case. In October 1999, the ARS determined that since the authority to review these cases had been given to the conference office, it should no longer hear such appeals. Independent institutions have had an appellate body because the NCAA student-athlete reinstatement staff and the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee process hardship-waiver requests for independent institutions. There is no other avenue for institutions that are members of a conference to appeal a hardship waiver once a conference office has rendered a decision. In order to maintain consistent and equitable treatment for all Division II institutions, the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee should serve as the appellate body for

all hardship waiver requests. This proposed change would not change the fact that conference offices, where appropriate, initially would process hardship waiver requests, but rather specify that an appeal of an initial decision would be processed by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 5 (NO. 2-26) ELIGIBILITY — U.S. SERVICE ACADEMIES, SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY PROVISIONS — 10-SEMESTER/15-QUARTER RULE

Intent: To specify that the NCAA Division II Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee shall administer waiver requests of the 10-semester/15-quarter rule for student-athletes of the national service academies.

Bylaws: Amend 14.9.1, Page 137, as follows:

[Division II]

“14.9.1 Ten-Semester/Fifteen-Quarter Rule. The *Management Council Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee*, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers to the 10-semester/15-quarter rule (see Bylaw 14.2) for student-athletes of the national service academies who have exhausted eligibility in one sport but wish to compete in another sport or sports in which they have eligibility remaining.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The NCAA Division II Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee currently administers waiver requests of the 10-semester/15-quarter rule pursuant to Bylaw 30.6. The committee believes that it also should administer waivers of the rule for student-athletes attending the national service academies who have exhausted eligibility in one sport but wish to compete in another sport or sports in which they have remaining eligibility.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 6 (NO. 2-27) FINANCIAL AID — BOOKS AND SUPPLIES — RESTITUTION FOR IMPROPER BENEFITS

Intent: To establish the general principle of restitution for violations of Bylaw 15.2.3 (books and supplies).

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.3.1 by adding new 15.2.3.1.1, Page 150, as follows:

[Division II]

“15.2.3.1 Dollar Limit. There is no dollar limit for required books and supplies a student-athlete may receive, provided books and supplies are required for courses in which the student-athlete is enrolled. The institution may provide the student-athlete with cash to purchase books and supplies, as long as the amount of cash provided is equal to the actual cost of the books or supplies purchased.

“15.2.3.1.1 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of Bylaw 15.2.3.1 in which the value of noncourse-related books and noncourse-related supplies is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual’s repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Currently, NCAA staff instructs institutions to cite Bylaws 15.2.3 and 16.3.2 when reporting violations of Bylaw 15 (15.2.3). The double citation creates confusion in the membership as to whether such a violation requires restitution. Amending these bylaws to incorporate the restitution clause will eliminate this confusion. Further, the amendment will reduce the number of cases NCAA staff and the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee will be required to process, furthering the spirit of deregulation.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

***NO. 7 (NO. 2-1) SENIOR WOMAN ADMINISTRATOR — DUTIES**

Intent: To better define the expectations of the senior woman administrator position in Division II and to specify that an institution that has a female director of athletics may designate a different female administrator to serve as the senior woman administrator.

Constitution: Amend 4.02.4, Page 22, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

"4.02.4 Senior Woman Administrator. A senior woman administrator is the highest ranking female administrator involved with the conduct of a member institution's intercollegiate athletics program. A senior woman administrator is a female professional athletics administrator who is a member of the institution's senior athletics management team. This female administrator must have substantive responsibilities from the conduct and administration of an institution's overall athletics program, and her gender should not dictate only gender-specific duties and responsibilities. An institution with a female director of athletics may designate a different female professional athletics administrator to serve as the institution's senior woman administrator."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Project Team to Review Issues Related to Diversity)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The Division II strategic plan and the guidelines for a model Division II conference identify the enhancement of the role of the senior woman administrator (SWA) as a top priority. This initiative includes ensuring the active involvement of female administrators as part of the athletics management team with program-wide administrative responsibilities, including decision-making at the institutional, conference and national levels. In Division II, 55 percent of institutions have designated full-time coaches or secretaries to serve as the senior woman administrator. Clearly, such appointments do not satisfy the spirit of the senior woman administrator definition set forth in Constitution 4.02.4 if such positions do not also include administrative responsibilities. Many senior woman administrators in Division II are also performing duties and handling issues solely related to women's sports interests. The senior woman administrator position was originally established as a way to involve an athletics administrator, who is female, in the decision-making process for the institution's overall intercollegiate athletics program. The SWA position was created as a way to ensure a female perspective to athletics administrative discussions, governance issues and policy-making decisions. As an athletics administrator, the Division II SWA should be involved in the oversight or management of the athletics department. The current definition also does not specify that a female athletics director may appoint a different female administrator to serve as the institution's senior woman administrator. The permissive legislation outlined in Constitution 4.02.4.2 will specify that such appointments may occur. This change should also enhance opportunities to involve female associate and assistant athletics directors in conference and national issues.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 224-11-2.

**NO. 8 (NO. 2-2) INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL —
BUDGETARY CONTROL — FINANCIAL
AUDIT**

Intent: To specify that a member institution may satisfy the “once-every-three years” financial audit requirement of its athletics department, provided the institution conducts an overall institutional financial audit at least once every three years and the overall institutional financial audit includes an audit of all athletics department funds.

Constitution: Amend 6.2.3.1, Page 52, as follows:

[Division II]

“6.2.3.1 Requirement. At least once every three years, all expenditures for or *in* **on** behalf of a member institution’s intercollegiate athletics programs, including those by any outside organization, agency or group of individuals (two or more), shall be subject to a financial audit (in addition to any regular financial audit policies and procedures of the institution) conducted for the institution by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected either by the institution’s chief executive officer or by an institutional administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer. **If, within the last three years, the institution has conducted an overall institutional audit that includes a financial audit of all athletics department funds, then the institution is not required to perform a separate financial audit of all athletics department expenditures.”**

[6.2.3.1.1 and 6.2.3.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council and Great Lakes Inter-collegiate Athletic Association and North Central Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The current requirement for an external audit of the athletics department every three years should be necessary only if the institution does not already conduct an overall institutional audit that includes an audit of all athletics department funds within that same time period. Many institutions already require regular institutional audits that include an audit of athletics department expenditures. Then, to meet the current NCAA requirement, the institution must hire expensive external auditors to review the same information. This proposed exception would reduce expenses and reduce the administrative burden for Division II institutions while maintaining that all athletics departments are subject to a financial audit at least once every three years.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 9 (NO. 2-3) INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL — SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION — COMPLIANCE REVIEW

Intent: To specify, at least once every 10 years, an institution’s rules-

compliance program shall be the subject of review by the NCAA, the conference office or an authority outside of the athletics department approved by the conference office.

Constitution: Amend 6.3 by adding new 6.3.2, Page 52, as follows:
[Division II]

“6.3.2 Compliance Review. At least once every 10 years, an institution’s rules-compliance program shall be the subject of a comprehensive review by the NCAA, the conference office or an authority outside of the athletics department approved by the conference office.”

Source: Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Conference and Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: In an effort to enhance the policy of the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG), which is to be completed once every five years, it seems appropriate for an institution to be the subject of an outside compliance review once every 10 years. These outside reviews can be done by the NCAA, the conference office or by an outside party approved by the conference office. Some conferences have policies requiring institutions to be the subject of a compliance review once every five years in conjunction with the ISSG. A “once-in-10 years” compliance review would further stress the importance of compliance with NCAA legislation. Finally, if the NCAA or conference office completes the review, no additional cost would be required on the part of the institution. The value and benefit of a compliance review is immeasurable. It ensures a “level playing field” in the areas of certification, recruitment and administration of financial aid.

Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Membership Committee): The Councils and committee oppose this proposal. This legislation is similar to the recently defeated proposal requiring compliance reviews. Compliance reviews should be voluntary.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 10 (NO. 2-4) AMATEURISM — DEFINITION OF PROFESSIONAL TEAM

Intent: To specify that a professional team is an organized team that provides any of its players more than actual and necessary expenses, as specified, or declares itself to be a professional team.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.02.4, Page 61, as follows:
[Division II]

“12.02.4 Professional Athletics Team. A professional team is any organized team that:

- “(a) Is a member of a recognized professional sports organization; Provides any of its players more than actual and necessary expenses for participation on the team, except as otherwise permitted by NCAA legislation. Actual and necessary expenses are limited to the following, provided the value of these items is commensurate with the fair market value in the locality of the player(s) and is not excessive in nature:
 - “(1) Meals directly tied to competition and practice held in preparation for such competition;
 - “(2) Lodging directly tied to competition and practice held in preparation for such competition;
 - “(3) Apparel, equipment and supplies;
 - “(4) Coaching and instruction;
 - “(5) Health/medical insurance;
 - “(6) Transportation (i.e., expenses to and from practice and competition, cost of transportation home to training/practice site at the beginning of the season and training/practice site to home at the end of season);
 - “(7) Medical treatment and physical therapy;
 - “(8) Facility usage; or
 - “(9) Entry fees; or
- “(b) Is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization (see also Bylaw 12.6.1.1); Declares itself to be professional.
- “(c) Is a member of a playing league that is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization (see also Bylaw 12.6.1.1); or
- “(d) Has an athlete receiving for his or her participation any kind of payment, directly or indirectly, from a professional team or professional sports organization (see also Bylaw 12.6.1.1).”

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.6.1.8, Page 74, as follows:

[Division II]

“12.6.1.8 Youth Teams. An individual may participate on a youth team, including a team consisting of prospects, sponsored by a professional sports team or organization without jeopardizing intercollegiate eligibility in that sport, provided the following conditions are met:

- “(a) The youth team must otherwise be an amateur team; and
- “(b) Sponsorship fees provided to the team are not earmarked for a particular individual.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Amateurism Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The current definition of a professional team has been used by the membership since 1974. This proposal amends the definition of a professional team for several reasons. First, the current reinstatement process handles cases involving “low” levels of amateur competition that result in a violation due to the team receiving funding indirectly from a professional team. For example, there are international youth teams in the sports of soccer and basketball that accept funding from professional teams and, thus, are considered professional teams under the current definition. Under the proposed definition, a participant’s receipt of actual and necessary expenses for participation on a professional team no longer makes the participant a professional in that sport. Further, sophisticated amateur competition can escape the current definition of a professional team even if the amateur team provides pay to its players. This proposal would address this loophole. Second, the current definition uses the word “professional” seven times. This proposal only would use it once in the actual definition. The concern of unintentionally affecting the eligibility of individuals who are playing on a “low-level” team is minimized; however, if there is competition that inappropriately results in a team being defined as professional, the reinstatement process will consider this a mitigating factor. Third, under the current definition, it is possible for a team to pay its players, but still not be considered a professional team as long as the pay does not come from a team, league or organization that labels itself as professional. This seems to contradict the basic premise of professional athletics. In our global environment, it is increasingly difficult to understand how international teams operate in the context of the current definition, since many countries and leagues define “professional” differently. To focus on whether the team pays its players or whether it calls itself professional likely will bring greater consistency in the application of NCAA rules to domestic and international student-athletes. Finally, Division I has adopted a similar definition of a professional team and consistency across divisions would benefit the Association.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 11 (NO. 2-5) AMATEURISM — EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES — PROFESSIONAL TEAM/LEAGUE

Intent: To permit student-athletes to receive educational expenses from a professional team/league under specified conditions.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 12.1.1.1.3.2 by adding new 12.1.1.1.3.2.3, Page 62, as follows:

[Division II]

“12.1.1.1.3.2 Educational Expenses from Outside Sports Team or Organization — Subsequent to Collegiate Enrollment. Educational expenses provided to an individual subsequent to collegiate enrollment by an outside sports team or organization that are

based in any degree on the recipient's athletics ability [except as specified in Bylaw 15.2.5.5], even if the funds are given to the institution to administer to the recipient.

[12.1.1.1.3.2.1 through 12.1.1.1.3.2.2 unchanged.]

"12.1.1.1.3.2.3 Educational Expenses — Professional Team or League. An individual may receive educational expenses awarded by a professional team or league, in accordance with the applicable conditions set forth in **Bylaw 15.2.5.6.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.5 by adding new 15.2.5.6, Page 152, as follows:

[Division II]

"15.2.5 Financial Aid from Outside Sources

[15.2.5.1 through 15.2.5.5 unchanged.]

"15.2.5.6 Educational Expenses — Professional Team or League. A former professional athlete may receive educational expenses from a professional team or league, provided the following conditions are met:

- "(a) The student-athlete no longer is involved in professional athletics;
- "(b) The student-athlete is not receiving any remuneration from a professional sports organization;
- "(c) The student-athlete does not have an active contractual relationship with any professional athletics team, although the student-athlete may remain bound by an option clause (i.e., a clause in the contract that requires assignment to a particular team, if the student-athlete's professional athletics career is resumed);
- "(d) Disbursement of the aid shall be through the member institution for the recipient's educational expenses while attending that institution;
- "(e) The value of the award alone or in combination with other aid per Bylaw 15.1.1 shall not exceed the value of a full grant-in-aid; and
- "(f) The recipient shall be considered a counter per Bylaw 15.5.1, and the amount shall be applied to the maximum award limitations of Bylaw 15.5 for the sport in question."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Amateurism Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: This proposal addresses a student-athlete welfare issue. The individuals who will benefit are those who do not succeed at the professional level and subsequently seek to attend a Division II institution and participate in athletics. In certain professional sports, such as Major League Baseball, some players continue to

receive educational expenses after leaving the team. These expenses are similar to other forms of countable outside aid. Further, this proposal does not change the current legislation that requires that the contract between the student-athlete and the professional team/organization be severed, and ensures that there is not a binding relationship between the student-athlete and the professional team or organization.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 12 (NO. 2-10) (DEREG. NO. 1) ELIGIBILITY — FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT**

Intent: To establish one bylaw for full-time enrollment requirements for practice and competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.6 by adding new 14.1.6.1, Pages 109-111, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.1.6 Full-Time Enrollment.

“**14.1.6.1 Requirement for Practice or Competition.** To be eligible for practice or competition, a student-athlete shall be enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies leading to a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as defined by the institution, which for purposes of this bylaw and its subsections shall not be less than 12-semester or quarter hours, regardless of the institution’s definition of a minimum full-time program of studies. For practice only, a violation of this bylaw shall be considered an institutional violation per Constitution 2.8.1; however, it shall not affect the student-athlete’s eligibility.

“**14.1.6.1.1 Drop/Add Course.** A student-athlete no longer shall be considered enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies (after dropping a course that places the student below full-time status) when the dropped course becomes official in accordance with procedures determined by the institution for all students. A student-athlete who is adding a course to reach full-time status shall become eligible for practice and competition once the course has been approved by the appropriate department head (or designated representative) and submitted to the registrar.

“**14.1.6.1.2 Withdrawal or Dismissal.** A student-athlete who withdraws or is dismissed from an institution is considered to be a prospective student-athlete eligible for recruitment by other NCAA institutions and may not continue to practice or compete with the original institution’s team. (See Bylaw 13.1.1.3.)

“14.1.6.1.3 Noncredit Work. Hours of noncredit work (including remedial courses) may be counted toward fulfilling the minimum full-time enrollment requirement, provided the noncredit work is given the same academic load value and is considered by the institution to be a requirement for the degree currently being pursued by the student-athlete.

“14.1.6.1.4 Concurrent Courses at Two Institutions. Courses taken concurrently at a second institution may be counted toward meeting the minimum 12-hour enrollment requirement, provided:

- “(a)** The certifying institution officially recognizes the student-athlete's combined hours as full-time enrollment for a minimum of 12 hours; and
- “(b)** Courses taken at the second institution will be included on the student-athlete's transcript at the institution where the student-athlete is seeking the degree.

“14.1.6.1.5 Cooperative Educational Exchange Program. A student-athlete may practice or compete for the certifying institution even though the student-athlete is enrolled in another institution in a cooperative educational exchange program, provided:

- “(a)** The certifying institution considers the student-athlete to be regularly enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies; and
- “(b)** All academic coursework is placed on the student-athlete's transcript and accepted toward his or her undergraduate degree at the certifying institution.

“14.1.6.1.6 Extension Courses. A student-athlete may use a combination of hours taken in residence during a regular term and extension courses taken from the certifying institution during that term to meet the minimum 12-hour enrollment requirement, provided the institution considers enrollment in such extension courses as regular course enrollment for all student-athletes during term time.

“14.1.6.1.7 Exceptions.

“14.1.6.1.7.1 Practice or Competition — Before Initial Full-Time Enrollment. A student-athlete may practice or compete during the official vacation period immediately before initial enrollment, provided the student-athlete shall:

- “(a)** Have been accepted by the institution for enrollment in a regular, full-time program of studies at the time of the individual's participation;

- “(b) No longer be enrolled in the previous educational institutions; and
- “(c) Be eligible under all institutional and NCAA requirements.

“**14.1.6.1.7.2 Practice or Competition — Eligibility between Terms.** To be eligible for practice or competition that takes place between terms, the student-athlete shall:

- “(a) Have been registered for the required minimum full-time load (see Bylaw 14.1.6.2.2) at the conclusion of the term immediately preceding the date of competition, if the student-athlete is continuing enrollment; or
- “(b) Be accepted for enrollment as a regular full-time student-athlete for the regular term immediately after the date of competition, if the student-athlete is either continuing enrollment or beginning enrollment (see Bylaw 14.1.1).

“**14.1.6.1.7.3 Practice or Competition — Final Semester/Quarter.** A student-athlete with athletics eligibility remaining may compete or participate in organized practice sessions while enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies, provided the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student-athlete is carrying (for credit) the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements.

“**14.1.6.1.7.3.1 Practice and Competition — Postseason.** The student-athlete granted eligibility to compete under this provision shall be eligible for any NCAA championship, that begins within 60 days after said semester or quarter, provided the student-athlete has not exhausted the five years or 10 semesters for completion of the individual's four seasons of eligibility (see Bylaw 14.2). Thereafter, the student-athlete shall forfeit eligibility in all sports, unless the student-athlete completes all degree requirements during that semester or quarter and is eligible to receive the baccalaureate diploma on the institution's next degree-granting date.

“**14.1.6.1.7.3.1.1 Waiver — Postseason.** The Management Council, or a committee designated by the Management Council to act for it, may waive the 60-

day requirement when an NCAA championship is conducted at the conclusion of the traditional playing season but begins more than 60 days after the end of said term. (See 15.01.5.1 for legislation related to the eligibility to receive institutional financial aid of student-athletes enrolled less than full time.)

“14.1.6.1.7.4 Practice or Competition — Graduate Program. A student-athlete may practice or compete while enrolled in a full-time graduate program as defined by the institution, and registered in not fewer than eight hours (see Bylaw 14.1.7).

“14.1.6.1.7.5 Practice — During First Week of Class. A student-athlete may practice, but may not compete, during the institution's first five days of classes, if the student-athlete is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies, provided the student-athlete is otherwise eligible under all institutional, conference and NCAA requirements.

“14.1.6.1.8 Waivers of the 12-Hour Requirement for Practice or Competition.

“14.1.6.1.8.1 Practice or Competition — Learning-Disabled and Handicapped Student-Athletes. The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee may waive the 12-hour requirement for a learning-disabled or handicapped student-athlete when objective evidence demonstrates that an institution defines full-time enrollment for that student-athlete to be less than 12 hours to accommodate for the student-athlete's learning disability or handicap.

“14.1.6.1.8.2 Practice or Competition — Nontraditional Academic Calendars or Cooperative Education Programs. A student-athlete in an institution that determines enrollment hours on a basis other than traditional semester or quarter hours or that conducts a cooperative educational program, may compete, if at the time of competition the student-athlete is enrolled for a comparable minimum academic load as determined by the Academic Requirements Committee.

“14.1.6.1.8.3 Practice or Competition — Olympic, Pan American, World Championships, World Cup or World University Games. The Academic Requirements Committee may waive the minimum full-time enrollment requirement for any participant in the Olympic, Pan American, World Championships, World Cup or World University Games

who, because of such participation, may lose eligibility for practice and competition in any sport.

“14.1.6.1.8.4 Practice — United States Olympic Committee/National Governing Body. A student-athlete with eligibility remaining who is not enrolled or who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies or a former student-athlete may participate on a regular basis in organized practice sessions, provided the following conditions are met:

- “(a) The practice sessions take place only at the institution(s) the individual previously attended as an undergraduate or currently attends or previously attended as a graduate student;
- “(b) The practice sessions involve an individual sport, rowing or synchronized swimming;
- “(c) The United States Olympic Committee or national governing body (NGB) in the sport has recommended the individual’s participation;
- “(d) The individual does not participate in any coaching activities unless the institution designates the individual in the appropriate coaching limits; and
- “(e) In the case of a student-athlete with NCAA eligibility remaining in the sport, such participation occurs only during the academic year immediately before the Olympic Games.

“14.1.6.1.8.4.1 Administration. This waiver shall be approved by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of independent institutions, by the Management Council. A member institution shall submit a waiver request that includes documentation that demonstrates that the conditions of Bylaw 14.1.6.1.8 have been met for each individual who wishes to participate in the institution’s practice sessions.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.6.1 through 14.1.6.2.6, Pages 109-111, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.1.6.1 Requirement for Practice. To be eligible to participate in organized practice sessions, a student-athlete shall be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies leading to a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as defined by the regulations of the certifying institution. A violation of this bylaw shall be considered an institutional violation per Constitution 2.8.1; however, it shall not affect the student-athlete’s eligibility.

“14.1.6.1.1 Practice Prior to Initial Enrollment. A student-ath-

lete may practice during the official vacation period immediately before initial enrollment, provided the student has been accepted by the institution for enrollment in a regular, full-time program of studies at the time of the individual's initial participation; is no longer enrolled in the previous educational institution; and is eligible under all institutional and NCAA requirements.

"14.1.6.1.2 Drop/Add Course. A student-athlete no longer shall be considered enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies (after dropping a course that places the student below full-time status) when the dropped course becomes official in accordance with procedures determined by the institution for all students. A student who is adding a course to reach full-time status shall become eligible for practice and competition once the course has been approved by the appropriate department head (or designated representative) and submitted to the registrar.

"14.1.6.1.3 Exception, Final Semester/Quarter. A student-athlete with athletics eligibility remaining may participate in organized practice sessions while enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies, provided the student is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student is carrying (for credit) the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements, as determined by the faculty of the institution.

"14.1.6.1.4 Withdrawal or Dismissal. A student-athlete who withdraws or is dismissed from an institution is considered to be a prospective student-athlete eligible for recruitment by other NCAA member institutions and may not continue to practice with the original institution's team.

"14.1.6.1.5 Exception — Practice during First Week of Class. A student-athlete may practice, but may not compete, during the institution's first five days of classes, if the student-athlete is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies, provided the student is otherwise eligible under all institutional, conference and NCAA requirements.

"14.1.6.1.6 Waiver — United States Olympic Committee/National Governing Body. A student with eligibility remaining who is not enrolled or who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies or a former student-athlete may participate on a regular basis in organized practice sessions, provided the following conditions are met:

"(a) The practice sessions take place only at the institution(s) the individual previously attended as an undergraduate or currently attends or previously attended as a graduate student;

"(b) The practice sessions involve an individual sport, rowing or synchronized swimming;

"(c) The United States Olympic Committee or national gov-

erning body (NGB) in the sport has recommended the individual's participation;

- “(d) The individual does not participate in any coaching activities unless the institution designates the individual in the appropriate coaching limits; and
- “(e) In the case of a student-athlete with NCAA eligibility remaining in the sport, such participation occurs only during the academic year immediately before the Olympic Games.

“14.1.6.1.6.1 *Administration.* This waiver shall be approved by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of independent institutions, by the Management Council. A member institution shall submit a waiver request that includes documentation that demonstrates that the conditions of Bylaw 14.1.6.1.6 have been met for each individual who wishes to participate in the institution's practice sessions.

“14.1.6.2 *Requirement for Competition.* To be eligible for competition, a student-athlete shall be enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies leading to a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as defined by the institution, which shall not be less than 129 semester or quarter hours.

“14.1.6.2.1 *Exceptions.* The following exceptions to the minimum 129-semester- or 129-quarter-hour enrollment are permitted:

“14.1.6.2.1.1 *Competition Prior to Initial Enrollment.* A student-athlete may compete during the official vacation period immediately before initial enrollment, provided the student has been accepted by the institution for enrollment in a regular, full-time program of studies at the time of the individual's initial participation; is no longer enrolled in the previous educational institution; and is eligible under all institutional and NCAA requirements.

“14.1.6.2.1.2 *Eligibility between Terms.* To be eligible for competition that takes place between terms, the student-athlete shall:

- “(a) Have been registered for the required minimum full-time load (see Bylaw 14.1.6.2.2) at the conclusion of the term immediately before the date of competition, if the student is continuing enrollment; or

- “(b) Be accepted for enrollment as a regular full-time student for the regular term immediately after the date of competition, if the student is either continuing enrollment or beginning enrollment (also see Bylaw 14.118).

“14.1.6.2.1.3 *Final Semester/Quarter.* A student-athlete may compete while enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies, provided the student is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate pro-

gram and the institution certifies that the student is carrying (for credit) the courses necessary to complete degree requirements. The student granted eligibility under this provision shall be eligible for any NCAA championship, and in Division I, for any postseason certified bowl game or National Invitation Tournament that begins within 60 days after said semester or quarter, provided the student has not exhausted the five years or 107 semesters for completion of the individual's four seasons of eligibility (see 14.2). Thereafter, the student shall forfeit eligibility in all sports, unless the student completes all degree requirements during that semester or quarter and is eligible to receive the baccalaureate diploma on the institution's next degree-granting date. The Management Council, or a committee designated by the Management Council to act for it, may waive the 60-day requirement when an NCAA championship, postseason certified bowl game or National Invitation Tournament is conducted at the conclusion of the traditional playing season but begins more than 60 days after the end of said term. (See 15.01.5.1 for legislation related to the eligibility to receive institutional financial aid of student-athletes enrolled less than full time.)

"14.1.6.2.1.4 Graduate Program. A student may compete while enrolled in a full-time graduate program as defined by the institution, but in any event not fewer than eight hours (see Bylaw 14.1.7).

"14.1.6.2.2 Full-Time Program-12-Hour Requirement. At the time of competition, a student-athlete shall be enrolled in not less than 12-semester or -quarter hours, regardless of the institution's definition of a minimum full-time program of studies.

"14.1.6.2.2.1 Waivers. Waivers may be granted to the minimum 129-semester or 129-quarter-hour enrollment as follows:

"14.1.6.2.2.1.1 Nontraditional Academic Calendars or Cooperative Education Programs. A student-athlete in an institution, that determines enrollment hours on a basis other than traditional semester or quarter hours or that conducts a cooperative educational program, may compete, if at the time of competition the student is enrolled for a comparable minimum academic load as determined by the Academic Requirements Committee.

"14.1.6.2.2.1.2 Olympic, Pan American, World Championships, World Cup or World University Games. The Academic Requirements Committee may waive the minimum full-time enrollment requirement for any participant in the Olympic, Pan American, World Championships, World Cup or World University Games who, because of such participation, may lose eligibility for practice and competition in any sport.

"14.1.6.2.2.1.3 Learning — Disabled and Handicapped Student-Athletes. The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee may waive the 129-hour requirement for a learning-disabled or handicapped student-athlete when objective evidence demonstrates that an institution defines full-time enrollment for that student-athlete to be less than 129 hours to accommodate for the student's learning disability or handicap.

"14.1.6.2.3 Noncredit Work. Hours of noncredit work (including remedial courses) may be counted toward fulfilling the minimum full-time enrollment requirement, provided the non-credit work is given the same academic load value and is considered by the institution to be a requirement for the degree currently being pursued by the student.

"14.1.6.2.4 Concurrent Courses at Two Institutions. Courses taken concurrently at a second institution may be counted toward meeting the minimum 129-hour enrollment requirement, provided:

- "(a) The certifying institution officially recognizes the student's combined hours as full-time enrollment for a minimum of 129 hours; and*
- "(b) Courses taken at the second institution will be included on the student's transcript at the institution where the student is seeking the degree.*

"14.1.6.2.5 Cooperative Educational Exchange Program. A student-athlete may represent the certifying institution in intercollegiate athletics even though at the time of competition the student is enrolled in another institution in a cooperative educational exchange program, provided:

- "(a) The certifying institution considers the student to be regularly enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies; and*
- "(b) All work is placed on the student's transcript and accepted toward his or her undergraduate degree at the certifying institution.*

"14.1.6.2.6 Extension Courses. A student-athlete may use a combination of hours taken in residence during a regular term and extension courses taken from the certifying institution during that term to meet the minimum 129-hour enrollment requirement, provided the institution considers enrollment in such extension courses as regular course enrollment for all students during term time."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: After reviewing the bylaws regarding the requirements for practice and competition, the Legislation Committee agreed that the legislation is somewhat duplicative and that combining By-laws 14.1.6.1 and 14.1.6.2 to create one bylaw for full-time enroll-

ment requirements would accomplish the deregulation objective and make the NCAA Division II Manual easier to understand.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 238-0-0.

**NO. 13 (NO. 2-11) ELIGIBILITY — PARTICIPATION IN
ORGANIZED COMPETITION —
ACADEMIC YEAR IN RESIDENCE**

Intent: To permit an individual who uses a season(s) of competition in a specific sport per Bylaw 14.2.4.3 (participation in organized competition prior to initial collegiate enrollment) to fulfill an academic year in residence at any NCAA active member institution, provided he/she does not engage in any competition in that specific sport while serving the residence requirement.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.2.2, Page 113, as follows:

[Division III]

“14.2.4.2.2 Academic Year in Residence. An individual who utilizes a season(s) of competition **in a specific sport** per 14.2.4.2, shall fulfill an academic year in residence **at any member institution** prior to being eligible to represent the **certifying institution in that specific sport** in intercollegiate competition.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The rationale for the academic year in residence is to ensure that a student-athlete who chooses not to enroll in college at his or her first opportunity following high-school graduation is committed to academics upon collegiate enrollment. The Amateurism Project Team originally recommended an official interpretation, which allowed the academic year in residence to be fulfilled at any Division II institution. Given the changes to the Division III amateurism rules and the ongoing examination of Division I's philosophy, the project team supports allowing the year in residence to be fulfilled at any NCAA active member institution, provided the student-athlete does not engage in any competition in that specific sport for which the year of residence has been required. The charging of seasons of competition under the rule will not change if this amendment is supported.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 14 (NO. 2-12) (DEREG. NO. 2) ELIGIBILITY —
HARDSHIP WAIVER — FIRST HALF OF
PLAYING SEASON**

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that in order to receive a medi-

cal hardship waiver, the injury or illness must occur before the completion of the first half of the playing season.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5, Page 114, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

"14.2.5 Hardship Waiver. A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee for reasons of "hardship." Hardship is defined as an incapacity resulting from an injury or illness that has occurred under all of the following conditions:

[14.2.5-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) The injury or illness occurs prior to the completion of the first half of the playing season that concludes with the NCAA championship in that sport (measured by the number of scheduled contests or dates of competition as established prior to the first scheduled contest or date of competition, not to exceed the maximum limitations in each sport as specified in Bylaw 17) and results in an incapacity to compete for the remainder of that playing season; and"

[14.2.5-(c) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5.2, Page 115, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

"14.2.5.2 Criteria for Administration of Hardship Waiver. The following criteria are to be employed in the administration of the hardship waiver:

[14.2.5.2.1 through 14.2.5.2.2 unchanged.]

"14.2.5.2.3 First-Half-of-Season Calculation. In determining if an injury or illness occurs in the first half of the season that concludes with the NCAA championship in a sport with an odd number of contests or dates of competition, the injury or illness must have occurred before the beginning of the varsity contest or date of competition that starts the second half of the season that concludes with the NCAA championship (e.g., an injury or illness occurring at any time after the beginning of the sixth game of an 11-game football schedule would be considered to be after the first half of the institution's season and would not qualify the student-athlete for a hardship waiver).

"14.2.5.2.4 Reinjury in Second Half of Season. A student-athlete who suffers an injury in the first half of the season that concludes with the NCAA championship, attempts to return to competition during the second half of the championship season and then is unable to participate further as a result of aggravating the original injury does not qualify for the hardship waiver."

[14.2.5.2.5 through 14.2.5.2.6 renumbered as 14.2.5.2.3 through 14.2.5.2.4, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003, for any injury or illness occurring on or after August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The primary guideline in determining whether a student-athlete qualifies for a hardship waiver should be the total number of contests in which a student-athlete participated, as opposed to when the contests occurred. This proposal benefits those student-athletes who would not otherwise be eligible for a medical hardship waiver because they sustain a season-ending injury late in the season, even though they have not participated in more than two contests or 20 percent of the scheduled contests.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 218-19-1.

NO. 15 (NO. 2-14) ELIGIBILITY — SEASON OF COMPETITION — WAIVER

Intent: To establish a season-of-competition waiver that may be granted due to extenuating circumstances for student-athletes who competed while eligible in a limited amount of competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.2 by adding new 14.2.7, Page 115, as follows:

[Division II]

“14.2.7 Season-of-Competition Waiver — Competition While Eligible. A student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition by the Student-Athlete Reinstate-ment Committee when, due to extenuating circumstances (per Bylaw 14.2.7.1.2), the student-athlete, while eligible, participated in a limited amount of competition. The com-petition must have occurred under all of the following con-ditions:

- “(a) The competition occurred while the student-athlete was representing an NCAA member institution;
- “(b) The competition occurred within the first half of the championship segment of the institution’s declared playing and practice season;
- “(c) The student-athlete did not compete in more than two contests or dates of competition (whichever is applica-ble to that sport) or 20 percent (whichever number is greater) of the institution’s completed contests. All competition (including a scrimmage) against outside participants shall be countable under this limitation in calculating both the number of contests or dates of competition in which the student-athlete participated and the number of contests or dates of competition during that season (both segments) in the sport.

“14.2.7.1 Administrative Criteria. The following criteria shall be employed in the administration of this season-of-competition waiver:

“14.2.7.1.1 Twenty-Percent Calculation. The requirements specified in Bylaw 14.2.5.2.5 shall apply to the 20-percent calculation specified in this waiver.

“14.2.7.1.2 Extenuating Circumstances. Extenuating circumstances include, but are not limited to, the following:

- “(a) The student-athlete officially withdrew from the institution as a result of a life-threatening injury or illness suffered by a member of the student-athlete’s immediate family, which clearly is supported by contemporaneous medical documentation;
- “(b) The student-athlete officially withdrew from the institution as a result of extreme financial difficulties as a result of a specific event (e.g., layoff, death in family) experienced by the student-athlete or an individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent. These circumstances must be clearly supported by objective documentation (e.g., decree of bankruptcy, proof of termination) and must be beyond the control of the student-athlete or the individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent;
- “(c) The student-athlete’s institution dropped the sport (in which the student has practiced or competed) from its intercollegiate program.

“14.2.7.1.3 Penalty. A student-athlete who is granted a waiver pursuant to Bylaw 14.2.7 shall be withheld from one contest of intercollegiate competition for each contest in which he or she competed.

“14.2.7.1.4 Review Authority. In cases where a student-athlete does not meet the extenuating circumstances listed in Bylaw 14.2.7.1.2, the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement shall have authority to review and grant waivers based on additional documented extenuating circumstances.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.6, Pages 115-116, as follows:

[Division II]

“14.2.6 Season-of-Competition Waiver — Competition While Ineligible. In conjunction with a request for restoration of eligibility and any conditions imposed thereon per Bylaw 14.12, a student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee when he or she participated in a limited amount of competition. The competition must have occurred under all of the following conditions.”

[14.2.6-(a) through 14.2.6-(e) unchanged.]

[14.2.6.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Administrative Review Subcommittee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Student-athletes, who engage in a limited amount of participation occurring before an extenuating circumstance preventing further participation, warrant relief from the normal application of the legislation. The Administrative Review Subcommittee currently has jurisdiction for this type of relief. Based on the increasing number of waiver requests regarding the use of a season, the Administrative Review Subcommittee has determined that the waiver should be codified in the legislation. Additionally, the Administrative Review Subcommittee determined that the authority for the granting the waiver should be transferred from the Administrative Review Subcommittee to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, which already has jurisdiction for “season of competition” waivers involving ineligible competition. This legislation would identify and clarify the circumstances warranting relief and would transfer to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee the authority to decide waivers for circumstances not explicitly noted in the legislation but still worthy of relief.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 16 (NO. 2-15) ELIGIBILITY — FRESHMAN ACADEMIC
REQUIREMENTS — CORE-CURRICULUM
REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To increase from 13 to 14 the minimum number of core-course units for a qualifier and to require the one additional core-course unit be earned in any core-course area.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, Page 116, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.3.1.1 Qualifier. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following minimum academic qualifications:

(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 14 academic courses per Bylaw 14.3.1.2, including the following:

“English 3 years

“Mathematics 2 years

"Natural or physical science
(including at least one laboratory
course if offered by the high school) 2 years

"Additional courses in English,
mathematics or natural or physical science 2 years
"Social science 2 years

“Additional academic courses

or nondoctrinal religion
(e.g., comparative religion) courses] 2 3 years

"The record of the above courses and course grades must be certified by the initial-eligibility clearinghouse using an official high-school transcript or official correspondence forwarded directly from the high school or on a high-school transcript forwarded by an institution's admissions office; and"

[14.3.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.2.6, Page 118, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

"14.3.1.2.6 Grade Value of Core Courses. The following grade values are to be used in determining a student's grade-point average in the core courses: A = 4 quality points, B = 3 quality points, C = 2 quality points, D = 1 quality point. In determining the core-curriculum grade-point average, each grade earned in a course (including all numerical grades) must be converted to this 4.000 scale on an individual-course basis. Pluses or minuses within a grade level shall not receive greater or lesser quality points. A school's normal practice of weighting honors or advanced courses may be used to compute the quality points awarded in those courses and the cumulative grade-point average, provided a written statement verifying the grading policy accompanies the prospective student-athlete's official grade transcript. An honors or an advanced course shall receive no greater than 1.00 additional quality point (e.g., A=5.000). In calculating the grade in a weighted honors or advanced course, if a high school does not assign quality points to its courses, quality points shall be added to each course before calculating the student's grade-point average and not added to a student's cumulative core-course grade-point average. The core-curriculum grade-point average may be calculated using the student's *13 14* best grades from courses that meet the distribution requirements of the core curriculum. Additional core courses (beyond the *13 14* required) may be used to meet the core-curriculum grade-point average, provided the distribution requirements are met."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2005, for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution full time on or after August 1, 2005.

Rationale: In an effort to enhance the academic preparedness of high-school students-athletes prior to enrollment in a Division II member institution, this proposal increases the minimum number of core-course units for initial-eligibility. NCAA Division II research indicates that the average number of core-course units completed by an NCAA Division II student-athlete who is declared eligible is 17.63. Further, research indicates that increasing the number of core-course units will add to a student's success on standardized tests.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 222-14-1.

***NO. 17 (NO. 2-16) (DEREG. NO. 3) ELIGIBILITY —
DETERMINATION OF FRESHMAN AND
TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER
ELIGIBILITY — PARTICIPATION
BEFORE CERTIFICATION**

Intent: To specify that the temporary certification period for recruited and nonrecruited freshman and transfer student-athletes will be a 45-day period.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.5.1, Page 120, as follows:
[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.3.5.1 Participation Before Certification — Recruited and Nonrecruited Student-Athlete. If a recruited or nonrecruited student-athlete reports for athletics participation before the high-school core-curriculum grade-point average and test score have been certified, the student may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of 45 days, provided the student is enrolled full time or has been accepted for enrollment as a regular full-time student. After this 45-day period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as a qualifier (as certified by the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse) to continue practicing or to compete, or the minimum requirements as a partial qualifier to continue practicing.”

“14.3.5.1.1 Recruited Student-Athlete. If a recruited student-athlete reports for athletics participation before the high-school core-curriculum grade-point average and test score have been certified, the student may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of two weeks, provided the student is enrolled full time or has been accepted for enrollment as a regular full-time student. After this two-week period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as a qualifier (as certified by the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse) to continue practicing or to compete, or the minimum requirements as a partial qualifier to continue practicing.”

“14.3.5.1.2 Nonrecruited Student-Athlete. If a nonrecruited student-athlete reports for athletics participation before the high-school core-curriculum grade-point average and test score have been certified, the student may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of 45 days, provided the student is enrolled full time or has been accepted for enrollment as a regular full-time student. After this 45-day period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as a qualifier (as certified by the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse) to continue practicing or to compete, or the minimum requirements as a partial qualifier to continue practicing.”

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.2.6, Page 130, as follows:
[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.5.4.2.6 Participation Prior to Certification — Recruited and

Nonrecruited Student-Athlete. If a recruited or a nonrecruited two-year college transfer reports for athletics participation before the student's high-school or two-year college academic record has been certified, the student may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of 45 days. After this period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as a transfer to continue practicing or to compete.

"14.5.4.2.6.1 Temporary Certification, Recruited Two-Year College Transfer. The requirements set forth in Bylaw 14.5.4 must be met before a student-athlete's transfer to the certifying institution. Thus, if a two-year college student transfers (as defined in Bylaw 14.5.2) to a Division I or II institution before the completion of applicable transfer requirements, the student is subject to the one-year residence requirement at the certifying institution, even though the student transfers back to the two-year college and completes the necessary requirements."

"14.5.4.2.6.2 Temporary Certification, Nonrecruited Two-Year College Transfer. If a nonrecruited two-year college transfer reports for athletics participation before the student's high-school or two-year college academic record has been certified, the student may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of 45 days. After this period, the student shall have established minimum requirements as a transfer to continue practicing or to compete."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Currently, the temporary certification period is "two weeks" for recruited prospects and "45 days" for nonrecruited prospects. The proposed legislation would only create consistency among recruited and non-recruited student-athletes. This change would not effect any of the financial aid concepts related to temporary certification in as much as Bylaw 15 would still govern financial aid. Finally, it is an inconsistent standard of measurement to use "days" for one group of student-athletes and "weeks" for another. Further, there does not appear to be any compelling reason why weeks should be considered for one group and days for a different group. This recommendation clearly meets the deregulation objective of creating legislation that is easier for the membership to interpret and apply.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 223-5-1.

***NO. 18 (NO. 2-17) (DEREG. NO. 4) SATISFACTORY-
PROGRESS REQUIREMENT — HOURS
EARNED OR ACCEPTED FOR DEGREE
CREDIT**

Intent: To specify that all credits earned during the first two years of

collegiate enrollment that are accepted toward any (as opposed to a student-athlete's designated) program at the certifying institution may be used for the purposes of satisfactory-progress requirements.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.1.4, Pages 123-124 , as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.4.3.1.4 Hours Earned or Accepted for Degree Credit. The provision that the calculation of credit hours under the satisfactory-progress regulation shall be based on hours earned or accepted for degree credit at the certifying institution in a student-athlete's specific baccalaureate degree program (see Bylaw 14.4.3.1.3) shall be met as follows:

“(a) During the first two years of enrollment, a student-athlete who has not yet designated a specific baccalaureate degree program may use credits acceptable toward any of the institution's degree programs;”

[14.4.3.1.4-(b) through 14.4.3.1.4-(d) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The committee agreed that the current legislation, which requires an institution, in the first two years of enrollment, to count only courses for a declared degree program when a student-athlete makes such a declaration in the first two years, has created an unintended result. The proposed legislation encourages a student-athlete not to declare a degree program in the first two years in order to avoid being “penalized” if he or she decides to take courses outside of that program. This has led to problems with academic advisement and scheduling that can be eliminated with the proposed change. Further, it is important to note that in most cases, courses taken in the first two years typically are general education courses, which arguably renders this requirement moot.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 232-2-0.

***NO. 19 (NO. 2-18) (DEREG. NO. 5) SATISFACTORY-
PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS —
FULFILLMENT OF MINIMUM GRADE-
POINT-AVERAGE REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To specify that minimum grade-point average requirements are calculated based on completed credit hours as opposed to full-time semester/quarter (terms) of attendance or seasons of competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.2, Page 124, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.4.3.2 Fulfillment of Minimum Grade-Point Average Requirements. A student-athlete shall meet the “satisfactory completion”

provision of this requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the individual in good academic standing, as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree. To fulfill the “satisfactory completion” provision of this requirement, a student-athlete who first enters a Division II institution after the 1988-89 academic year must achieve the following cumulative minimum grade-point average (based on a maximum of 4.000):

- “(a) *After the completion of the first season of competition At the completion of 24-semester or 36-quarter hours:* 1.600;
- “(b) *After the completion of the second season of competition At the completion of 48-semester or 72-quarter hours:* 1.800; and
- “(c) *After the completion of the third season of competition and subsequent seasons of competition At the completion of 72-semester or 98-quarter hours:* 2.000; and
- “(d) **At the completion of 96-semester or 144-quarter hours: 2.000.”**

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.2.4, Page 124, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.4.3.2.4 Determination of Seasons of Competition. Any competition in a season shall count as a season of competition for purposes of this legislation. The following provisions also shall apply:

- “(a) *Hardship Years.* Years for which the student-athlete was granted a hardship per Bylaw 14.2.5 shall be included in determining the number of seasons of competition in which a student-athlete has participated.
- “(b) *Noncompetition/Redshirt Years.* Years in which the student-athlete does not compete shall not be considered in calculating the number of seasons of competition.
- “(c) *Transfer Students.* Years in which a transfer student competed at another institution shall be included as seasons of competition in determining the applicable grade-point standard.
- “(d) *Multisport Participation.* The grade-point average necessary for a multisport participant shall be determined on the basis of the number of seasons completed in the sport in which the student-athlete has competed in the most seasons of competition.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2004.

Rationale: This proposal eliminates the confusion of whether a season of competition counts when determining grade-point average requirements (e.g. hardship vs. redshirt, multiple sport participants, transfer students, etc.). It also aligns criteria for determining minimum grade-point average requirements with the criteria used to determine credit hours and declaration-of-degree requirements. Most importantly, it strengthens academic requirements by requiring stu-

dent-athletes to maintain an acceptable grade-point average regardless of whether they compete and use a season of competition or regardless of whether they are enrolled full time or not.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 227-5-1.

***NO. 20 (NO. 2-19)ELIGIBILITY — SATISFACTORY
PROGRESS — FULFILLMENT OF
MINIMUM GRADE-POINT AVERAGE
REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete must present a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 1.800 and 1.900 after a student's first and second seasons of competition.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.2, Page 124, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

"14.4.3.2 Fulfillment of Minimum Grade-Point Average Requirements. A student-athlete shall meet the "satisfactory completion" provision of this requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the individual in good academic standing, as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree. To fulfill the "satisfactory completion" provision of this requirement, a student-athlete who first enters a Division II institution after the 1988-89 academic year must achieve the following cumulative minimum grade-point average (based on a maximum of 4.000):

- (a) After the completion of the first season of competition: **1.600 1.800;**
- (b) After the completion of the second season of competition: **1.800 1.900;** and
- (c) After the completion of the third season of competition and subsequent seasons of competition: **2.000."**

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2004.

Rationale: This proposal strengthens satisfactory-progress requirements to help ensure that student-athletes are in a position to graduate. Current standards require a student-athlete to achieve a minimum grade-point average of 1.600 after the first season of competition, 1.800 after the second season of competition and a 2.000 after the third and subsequent seasons of competition. The Council believes that the current requirements are not rigorous enough to put a Division II student-athlete in a position to graduate, and that a student who is only meeting the minimum requirements is much less likely to graduate. The Council feels that increased requirements would help to ensure that student-athletes can be successful in achieving their academic goals. Finally, this

proposed change does not change the current requirement that a student-athlete must present a grade-point average of 2.000 after his or her third and subsequent seasons of competition.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 218-14-4.

***NO. 21 (NO. 2-20) (DEREG. NO. 6) SATISFACTORY
PROGRESS — FULFILLMENT OF
GRADE-POINT AVERAGE
REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To specify that for purposes of calculating student-athletes' minimum grade-point averages the institution must use the calculation method used by the institution for all students.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.2.1, Page 124, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

"14.4.3.2.1 Calculation of Grade-Point Average for Student-Athletes Entering a Division II Institution after the 1988-89 Academic Year. For those student-athletes first entering a Division II institution after the 1988-89 academic year, A student-athlete must meet the cumulative minimum grade-point average must be achieved at the certifying institution, shall be based on the method of calculation used by the institution for calculating grade-point averages for all students and shall include all only course work normally counted by taken at the institution in such calculations.

"14.4.3.2.2 Calculation of Grade-Point Average for Student-Athletes Entering a Collegiate Institution on or after August 1, 1991. For those satisfactory-progress grade-point calculations that occur on or after August 1, 1996, the cumulative minimum grade-point average must be achieved based only on course work taken at the certifying institution.

"14.4.3.2.2.1 Course Work after Enrollment. After enrollment at the certifying institution, course work taken at another institution may be used in calculating the student-athlete's cumulative grade-point average, provided:

"(a) The student-athlete receives prior approval from the appropriate academic officials at the certifying institution to take the course;

"(b) The course is accepted as degree credit and placed on the student-athlete's official transcript at the certifying institution; and

"(c) It is the certifying institution's normal policy to include such course work for all students in calculating the cumulative grade-point average.

"14.4.3.2.3 Additional Grade-Point Average Calculation Provisions. The following additional grade-point average calculation provisions shall apply to the provisions of 14.4.3.2.1 and 14.4.3.2.1.2:

- “(a) Summer School Courses. Summer school courses shall be used in determining whether the student-athlete has achieved the minimum grade-point average.*
- “(b) Pass/Fail Grades. Pass/fail grades shall not be used in determining the minimum grade-point average.*
- “(c) Repeated Courses. An institution is not required to include the initial grade from a course that has been repeated, unless the institution’s policy is to include the grade in calculating the grade-point average for all students at that institution.”*

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003. (For all certifications subsequent to August 1, 2003.)

Rationale: The Legislation Committee agreed that the distinguishing dates of the student-athlete’s initial collegiate enrollment were no longer necessary and could be removed. Further, the “subsections” referring to calculation of grade-point averages can be eliminated if the new proposed legislation is adopted because the new proposed legislation refers to the institution’s own method of calculating. Finally, by only including courses taken at the certifying institution, the calculation is simplified further.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 220-10-1.

***NO. 22 (NO. 2-21) (DEREG. NO. 7) ELIGIBILITY —
SATISFACTORY-PROGRESS
REQUIREMENTS — REGULATIONS FOR
ADMINISTRATION OF SATISFACTORY
PROGRESS**

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that prior approval be obtained from the certifying institution for courses taken during another institution’s summer term that are to be used in determining academic status and allow institutions to apply their own policies to determine whether such courses may be used toward academic standing and satisfactory-progress requirements.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.3.4, Page 122, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.4.3.3.4 Prior Approval — Summer Courses at Other Institutions. Prior approval by appropriate academic officials of the certifying institution is required, if courses taken during another institution’s summer term are to be used in determining the student’s academic status (i.e., good academic standing and satisfactory progress). Under limited circumstances, the Academic Requirements Committee may grant waivers for student-athletes who did not request or receive prior approval.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Current articulation agreements between institutions already contain lists of transferable courses. This proposal eliminates the need for unnecessary preapproval of summer courses and streamlines the process as one to be handled per institutional policy. Additionally, this proposal will reduce the processing of “rubber stamped” satisfactory-progress waivers for transferable courses that were not “preapproved.” This recommendation satisfies the deregulation goal of eliminating legislation that requires unnecessary, and in many cases repetitive, documentation by compliance administrators.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 224-10-0.

***NO. 23 (NO. 2-22) (DEREG. NO. 8) TRANSFER
REGULATIONS — FULFILLMENT OF
RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT IN NIGHT
SCHOOL**

Intent: To eliminate the requirements relating to a transfer student serving his or her residence requirement while attending an institution's night school.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.1.2, Page 127, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.5.1.2 Fulfillment of Residence Requirement in Night School. When a student transfers to a member institution and is required to fulfill a residence requirement before being eligible to participate in competition, it is permissible for the transfer student to meet the requirement by attending an institution’s night school, provided the following conditions are met:

- “(a) The night school has regular terms (semesters or quarters) that are the same as the institution’s day school;*
- “(b) The student is enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies during each night term counted; and*
- “(c) The student is considered by the institution to be a regularly matriculated student in each term.”*

[14.5.1.3 through 14.5.1.6 renumbered as 14.5.1.2 through 14.5.1.5, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: When this legislation was adopted, most likely there were not a significant number of institutions that had class offerings at night comparable to what is available now. Most institutions now offer a significant number of courses at night, often taught by “traditional”

full-time faculty and structured and credited consistent with courses taught during the day; therefore, this legislation is irrelevant.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 219-1-4.

***NO. 24 (NO. 2-23) (DEREG. NO. 9) TWO-YEAR COLLEGE
TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS —
QUALIFIERS, PARTIAL QUALIFIERS
AND NONQUALIFIERS**

Intent: To specify that the requirements for competition, practice and athletics aid for two-year college transfers are the same for qualifiers, partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4, Page 129, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.5.4 Two-Year College Transfers. A student who transfers to a member institution from a two-year college or from a branch school that conducts an intercollegiate athletics program must complete an academic year of residence, unless the student meets the following eligibility requirements applicable to the division of which the certifying institution is a member. Further, a transfer student-athlete admitted after the 12th class day may not use that semester or quarter for the purpose of establishing residency.

“14.5.4.1 To Division II Institutions

“14.5.4.1.1 *Qualifier. A transfer student from a two-year college who was a qualifier (per Bylaw 14.3.1.1) is eligible in Division II institutions for competition during the first academic year in residence only if the student has:*

- “(a) Graduated from the two-year college; or
- “(b) Presented a minimum of 24-semester or 36-quarter hours of transferable-degree credit with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (see Bylaw 14.5.4.2.3.2) and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the two-year college (excluding summer sessions).

“14.5.4.1.2 *Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier. A transfer student from a two-year college who was a partial qualifier (per 14.3.1) is eligible for competition and a nonqualifier (per 14.3.1) is eligible for athletics aid, practice and competition during the first academic year in residence only if the student has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least two semesters or three quarters and has:*

- “(a) Graduated from the two-year college; or
- “(b) Presented a minimum of 24-semester or 36-quarter hours of transferable-degree credit with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (see Bylaw 14.5.4.2.3.2) and, for those student-athletes first entering a two-year collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996, satisfactorily completed an average of

at least 12-semester or -quarter hours of transferable-degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution for each academic term of full-time attendance.

“14.5.4.1.1 Eligibility for Competition, Practice and Athletics Aid. A transfer student from a two-year college is eligible for competition, practice and athletics aid during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution if the following requirements have been met:

- “(a) The student-athlete has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least two semesters or three quarters; and
- “(b) The student-athlete has satisfied one of the following provisions:
 - “(1) Graduated from the two-year college; or
 - “(2) Presented a minimum of 24-semester or 36-quarter hours of transferable-degree credit with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (see Bylaw 14.5.4.2.3.2)and, for those student-athletes first entering a two-year collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996, satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12-semester or -quarter hours of transferable-degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution for each academic term of full-time attendance.

“14.5.4.1.1.1 Qualifiers and Partial Qualifiers. Qualifiers and partial qualifiers who do not meet the requirements set forth in Bylaw 14.5.4.1 may practice and receive athletics aid (but may not compete) at the certifying institution during their first academic year of residence.

“14.5.4.1.1.2 Nonqualifiers. Nonqualifiers who do not meet the requirements set forth in Bylaw 14.5.4.1 may receive nonathletics aid (but may not compete, practice or receive any athletics aid) at the certifying institution during their first academic year in residence.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The requirements for a two-year college transfer who is a qualifier are not dramatically different from the requirements for students who are partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers. In fact, the only distinction between the two subgroups is that student-athletes who are qualifiers simply must satisfactorily complete 24

semesters or 36 quarter hours; whereas, partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers must complete 24 semesters or 36 quarter hours and average 12 hours per term of actual attendance. Making the requirements the same facilitates the administration of the bylaw. In addition, this proposed change will not alter the present distinctions between qualifiers, partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers regarding the effects of not meeting the requirements.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 207-21-5.

***NO. 25 (NO. 2-24) (DEREG. NO. 10) TRANSFERS — 4-2-4 TRANSFERS**

Intent: To specify that 4-2-4 transfers will be certified in the same manner as 2-4 transfers.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.2, Page 129, as follows:
[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.5.4.2.1 Previous Enrollment at Two-Year Institution. The two-year college transfer requirements set forth in 14.5.4.1.1 and 14.5.4.1.2 apply to all two-year college transfers regardless of whether the student-athlete attended one or more four-year colleges prior to his or her full-time enrollment at the two-year institution.”

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.3 by adding new 14.5.4.3.4, Page 128, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.5.4.3 Exceptions or Waivers for Transfer from Two-Year Colleges. A transfer student from a two-year college or from a branch school that conducts an intercollegiate athletics program is not subject to the residence requirement at the certifying institution, if any one of the following conditions is met. An individual who is a partial qualifier or nonqualifier shall not be permitted to use the exceptions under this bylaw.

[14.5.4.3.1 through 14.5.4.3.3 unchanged.]

“14.5.4.3.4 Return to Original Institution Exception. The student returns to the four-year college from which he or she transferred to the two-year college, provided the student did not have an unfulfilled residence requirement at the time of the transfer from the four-year college. The amount of time originally spent in residence at the first four-year college may be used by the student in completing the unfulfilled residence requirement at that institution.”

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.6, Page 134, as follows:
[Division II, Roll Call]

“14.5.6 “4-2-4” College Transfers. A student who transfers from a four-year college to a two-year college and then to the certifying in-

stitution shall complete one academic year of residence at the certifying institution, unless the student has completed a minimum of 24-semester or 36-quarter hours at the two-year college after transfer from the four-year college most recently attended, one calendar year has elapsed since the student's departure from the previous four-year college, and the student has graduated from the two-year college. The 24-semester or 36-quarter hours must be transferable-degree credit to the certifying institution with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (see Bylaw 14.5.4.2.3.2);

“14.5.6.1 Exceptions. A “4-2-4” transfer student who does not meet the requirements of Bylaw 14.5.6 is not subject to the residence requirement for intercollegiate competition, if any of the following conditions is met:

- “(a) The student returns to the four-year college from which he or she transferred to the two-year college, provided the student did not have an unfulfilled residence requirement at the time of the transfer from the four-year college. The amount of time originally spent in residence at the first four-year college may be used by the student in completing the unfulfilled residence requirement at that institution;
- “(b) The student initially was enrolled in a four-year collegiate institution that never sponsored the student's sport on the intercollegiate level while the student was in attendance at the institution (provided the student never had attended any other four-year collegiate institution that offered intercollegiate competition in that particular sport) and provided the student was a qualifier and satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12-semester or -quarter hours of transferable-degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution during each academic term of attendance with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (see Bylaw 14.5.4.2.3.2), and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the two-year college (excluding summer sessions); or
- “(c) For a consecutive two-year period immediately before the date on which the student begins participation (practice and/or competition), the student has neither practiced nor competed in the involved sport in intercollegiate competition or has neither practiced nor competed in organized noncollegiate amateur competition while enrolled as a full-time student in a collegiate institution. This two-year period does not include any period of time before the student's initial collegiate enrollment.
- “(d) **Nonrecruited Student Exception** The student transfers to the certifying institution and the following conditions are met:
 - “(1) The student was not recruited per 13.02.11.1 by the certifying institution;

- “(2) No athletically related financial assistance has been received by the student;
- “(3) The student has neither practiced nor competed in intercollegiate athletics before transfer, except that a student-athlete may have participated in limited pre-season tryouts; and
- “(4) The student was eligible for admission to the certifying institution before initial enrollment at the two-year college.

“14.5.6.2 Calendar-Year Time Lapse. It is not required that the calendar year specified in Bylaw 14.5.6 elapse before the student’s initial enrollment as a regular student in the second four-year institution, but the calendar year must elapse before the student represents the certifying institution in intercollegiate competition. However, the student-athlete shall be eligible on the first day of classes or on the date of the first scheduled intercollegiate contest that falls earlier than the first day of classes in the regular academic term in which the student would become eligible, provided the student has fulfilled the one-academic-year requirement.

“14.5.6.3 Transfer Prior to Completion of Requirements. The transfer requirement set forth in Bylaw 14.5.6 must be met before the student-athlete’s transfer to the certifying institution. Thus, if a student-athlete transfers from a four-year institution to a two-year college and, before completing the applicable transfer requirements, transfers to a Division I or II institution, the student-athlete shall be subject to the one-year residence requirement, even though during the course of that one-year residence at the certifying institution, the student-athlete may complete the necessary requirements.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The proposed modification would simplify the transfer legislation without creating a competitive advantage. The appropriate transfer “category” would be determined entirely by the “classification” of the institution the individual most recently attended. For example, a “4-2-4” transfer student would have to satisfy the “2-4” transfer requirements. All transfer exceptions for both “2-4” and “4-4” transfers would remain and transfer student-athletes would have to satisfy a transfer exception based on the “classification” of the most recent institution he or she has attended or serve a year of residence at the certifying institution.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 226-6-1.

***NO. 26 (NO. 2-25) (DEREG. NO. 11) ELIGIBILITY — TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — COMPETITION IN YEAR OF TRANSFER**

Intent: To specify a two-year college transfer, who has met the two-year transfer eligibility requirements is not eligible to compete during the segment that concludes with the NCAA championship at the certifying institution if the student-athlete has competed during that segment of the same academic year in that sport at the previous two-year institution.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4.2.7, Pages 130-131, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

"14.5.4.2.7 Competition in Year of Transfer. A transfer student from a two-year college institution, who has met the two-year transfer eligibility requirements (per Bylaw 14.5.4), is not eligible for regular-season or to compete during the segment that concludes with the NCAA championship competition in a sport if the student-athlete has competed at the two-year college in any competition other than regularly scheduled scrimmages in that sport during the same academic year. Such scrimmages must meet the following criteria: at the certifying institution if the student-athlete has competed during that segment of the same academic year in that sport at the previous two-year institution.

- "(a) The scrimmage is approved by the two-year college;*
- "(b) No official score is kept;*
- "(c) No admission is charged;*
- "(d) No official time is kept;*
- "(e) The scrimmage is played before the two-year college's first regularly scheduled outside competition; and*
- "(f) The student-athlete participates in not more than two such scrimmages or dates of competition per academic year."*

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.4, Page 133, as follows:

[Division II, Roll Call]

"14.5.5.4 Competition in Year of Transfer. A transfer student from a four-year institution, who has received a waiver of or exception to the transfer residence requirement (per Bylaw 14.5.5.3), is not eligible to compete at the certifying institution during the segment that concludes with the NCAA championship at the certifying institution if the student-athlete has competed during that segment of the same academic year in that sport at the previous four-year institution."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: There is no competitive advantage by allowing a "2-4" transfer to compete in the nonchampionship segment at the two-year college, and, subsequently, allowing them to compete in the

championship segment of that same year at the certifying institution. Further, this proposed change eliminates the difficulty institutions experience in attempting to determine whether a two-year college “scrimmage” satisfies the exception requirements set forth in the existing legislation regarding competition in year of transfer for two-year college transfers.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted, 231-4-2.

NO. 27 (NO. 2-29) PERMISSIBLE BENEFITS — COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS — CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIPS

Intent: To permit an institution to provide six complimentary admissions to a student-athlete who participates in or is a member of a team participating in a conference championship.

Bylaws: Amend 16.2.1.1.2, Page 165, as follows:

[Division II]

“16.2.1.1.2 Exception — **Conference Championships**, NCAA Championships and Bowl Games. An institution may provide each student-athlete who participates in or is a member of a team participating in an **conference championship**, NCAA championship or bowl game with six complimentary admissions to all contests at the site at which the student (or team) participates.

Source: NCAA Division II Management Council (Legislation Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Current NCAA legislation permits student-athletes to receive six complimentary admissions to NCAA championships and postseason bowl games. This proposal would permit an institution to provide the same number of complimentary admissions for conference championships, thus bringing consistency to the number of complimentary admissions permitted for similar postseason competitions.

SAAC Position: Oppose.

Action: Defeated, 97-135-5.

NO. 28 (NO. 2-35) EMERGING SPORTS — EQUESTRIAN AND RUGBY

Intent: To add the sports of equestrian and rugby as emerging sports for women.

Bylaws: Amend 20.02.5, Page 259, as follows:

[Division II]

“20.02.5 Emerging Sports for Women. The following shall be considered emerging sports for women and countable for purposes of revenue distribution (i.e., for sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid):

- “(a) Team Sports: team handball, **rugby** and synchronized swimming; and
 - “(b) Individual Sports: archery, badminton, bowling, **equestrian** and squash.”
- [Remainder of 20.02.5 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The Championships Committee believes that there is a sufficient interest level and number of female participants in the sports of equestrian and rugby to merit their inclusion on the list of emerging sports for women.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 29

**PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
FOOTBALL — PRESEASON
CONDITIONING**

Intent: In football, to amend the preseason practice legislation as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 17.11.2, Page 206, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.11.2 Preseason Practice

“17.11.2.1 First Practice Date — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence official preseason football practice sessions in the championship segment, for the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team before August 10 or **14 days prior to** the first day of class, whichever occurs earlier.

“17.11.2.2 Three-Day, Noncontact, Conditioning Practice Period. Physical activity during the first three days of the preseason practice period shall be limited to noncontact, conditioning drills. No football gear or protective equipment other than headgear, shoulder pads, shoes, pants and porous, lightweight jerseys shall be worn by players during practice sessions in this three-day period.

“17.11.2.2.1 Counting Sundays. If one of the first three days of an institution’s football practice schedule is a Sunday used for noncontact, conditioning drills, that Sunday may not be counted toward fulfillment of the mandatory three-day conditioning practice requirement.

“17.11.2.32 Activities Prior to First Practice Date. It shall be permissible to conduct a recognized medical test included as part of the permissible **Prior to participation in any pre-season activities, all prospects and student-athletes shall be required to undergo** a medical examination administered or supervised by a physician or trainer to deter-

mine the health status of the systems of the body (i.e., cardiovascular field test).

“17.11.2.3 Five-Day Acclimatization Period. Preseason practice shall begin with a five-day acclimatization period for both first-time participants (e.g., freshman and transfers) and continuing student-athletes. All student-athletes, including walk-ons who arrive to preseason practice after the first day of practice are required to undergo a five-day acclimatization period. The five-day acclimatization period shall be conducted as follows:

- “(a) Institutions may not conduct conditioning, speed, strength or agility tests prior to the start of the five-day acclimatization period.
- “(b) Participants shall not engage in more than one on-field practice per day during the five-day period. On field practices shall last no longer than three hours.
- “(c) During the first two days of the acclimatization period, helmets shall be the only piece of protective equipment student-athletes may wear. During the third and fourth days of the acclimatization period, helmets and shoulder pads shall be the only pieces of protective equipment student-athletes may wear. During the final day of the five-day period and on any days thereafter, student-athletes may practice in full pads.

“17.11.2.4 Preseason Activities After Five-Day Acclimatization Period. The remaining preseason practice period shall be conducted as follows:

- “(a) Subsequent to the five-day acclimatization period, institutions may practice in full pads. However, an institution may not conduct multiple on-field practice sessions (e.g., two-a-days or three-a-days) on consecutive days;
- “(b) Student-athletes shall not engage in more than three hours of on-field practice activities on those days during which one practice is permitted;
- “(c) Student-athletes shall not engage in more than five hours of on-field practice activities on those days during which more than one practice is permitted; and
- “(d) On days that institutions conduct multiple practice sessions, student-athletes must be provided with at least three continuous hours of recovery time between the end of the first practice and the start of the last practice that day. During this time student-athletes may not attend any meetings or engage in other athletically related activities (e.g., weight lifting); however, time spent receiving medical treatment and eating meals may be included as part of the recovery time.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Football Issues Project Team)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: This proposal is based on a study of out of season conditioning and preseason conditioning activities. The study involved input from sports-medicine staff, student-athletes, coaches and administrators. This proposal is an attempt to minimize the health and safety risks to student-athletes. The safety goal of this recommendation is to minimize catastrophic health events during preseason conditioning and to reduce the risk of injury (currently four times higher in preseason than in regular season) and heat illness in pre-season football practice. In 2001-02, the NCAA Injury Surveillance System showed a four-times higher risk of time-loss injuries in pre-season than during the regular season. Additionally, institutions that responded to the survey reported, on average, more than one heat illness during preseason practice. In fact, Division II's heat illness is greater than any other fall sport and is greater than the number of injuries and illnesses reported in Division I football. A five-day period to acclimate to equipment and exercise intensity at the start of formal preseason practice is expected to minimize the risk for such illnesses. Enhanced recovery during preseason practice by modifying the schedule of double or multiple practices on one day, further minimizes the risk for heat-related illnesses. In addition, daily hour limitations were incorporated into the model to reduce the likelihood of such illnesses.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Part A moot due to approval of Part C of amended Proposal No. 36. Part B adopted.

RECRUITING

NO. 30 (NO. 2-9) RECRUITING — CAMP OR CLINIC — EMPLOYMENT OF PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE

Intent: To permit a prospective student-athlete, who has signed a National Letter of Intent (NLI), to be employed at that institution's summer camp or clinic for up to a total of 10 camp days.

Bylaws: Amend 13.13.1.5.1 by adding new 13.13.1.5.1.1, Page 97, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.13.1.5.1.1 Exception. A prospective student-athlete may be employed for a maximum of 10 camp days at the camp or clinic of the institution with which he or she has signed a National Letter of Intent (NLI)."

Source: Great Lakes Valley Conference and Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Many Division II coaches feel the adoption to this proposal would allow prospective student-athletes who have signed a National Letter of Intent (NLI) an opportunity to acclimate themselves to the college campus environment without having the pressures of school and practice. Financially, the cost of permitting an institution to employ a prospective student-athlete who has signed a NLI in a summer camp or clinic would be minimal since compensation and other expenses would be taken out of camp revenues. Limiting the number of days a prospective student-athlete may be employed at an institution's summer camp or clinic to 10 would prevent abuse of this legislation.

Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils oppose this proposal. The Legislation Committee takes no position on this proposal.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 30-1

**RECRUITING — CAMP OR CLINIC —
EMPLOYMENT OF PROSPECTIVE
STUDENT-ATHLETE**

Intent: To specify that Proposal No. 30 applies only to basketball student-athletes.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 30, 13.13.1.5.1.1, Page 97, as follows:

[Division II]

“13.13.1.5.1.1 Exception — **Basketball**. In basketball, A a prospective student-athlete may be employed for a maximum of 10 camp days at the camp or clinic of the institution with which he or she has signed a National Letter of Intent (NLI).”

Source: Great Lakes Valley Conference and Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Proposal No. 30 should be applicable to only prospective student-athletes in basketball. Such an amendment better reflects the intent of the original proposal, which was sponsored in response to a request from the Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA). Further, in reviewing the sports sponsorship statistics for Division II, it appears basketball is sponsored by more Division II institutions than any other sport. The sponsors would argue that Division II schools are more likely to sponsor summer basketball camps than camps in other NCAA sports.

SAAC Position: Oppose.

Action: Defeated.

**NO. 31 (NO. 2-36) RECRUITING — WOMEN'S BASKETBALL
— DEAD PERIOD**

Intent: In women's basketball, to establish a dead period between the

Saturday prior to the start of the Division I Women's Basketball Championship through Wednesday, noon, following the championship game.

Bylaws: Amend 30.11.2, Page 292, as follows:

[Division II]

"30.11.2 Basketball, Women's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to women's basketball in Division II:

[30.11.2-(a) through 30.11.2-(j) unchanged.]

**"(k) During the Saturday prior to the start
of the Division I Women's Basketball
Championship through Wednesday
noon after the Championship game. Dead Period"**

[30.11.2-(k) relettered as 30.11.2-(l) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council and Great Lakes Valley Conference and Northeast 10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: This legislation would give Division II women's basketball coaches the opportunity to attend the Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA) Convention and the NCAA Division I Women's Final Four. Presently, this is a "contact" period on the Division II women's basketball recruiting calendar. A "dead" period would allow coaches to attend the convention and Women's Final Four without feeling they are at a recruiting disadvantage. It is anticipated that attendance at both events will increase due to this change on the recruiting calendar.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 31-1	RECRUITING — WOMEN'S BASKETBALL — DEAD PERIOD
-----------------	--

Intent: To change the effective date of Proposal No. 31 from August 1, 2003, to immediately.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 31, 30.11.2, Page 292, as follows:

[Division II]

"30.11.2 Basketball, Women's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to women's basketball in Division II:

[30.11.2-(a) through 30.11.2-(j) unchanged.]

**"(k) During the Saturday prior to the start
of the Division I Women's Basketball
Championship through Wednesday
noon after the Championship game. Dead Period"**

[30.11.2-(k) relettered as 30.11.2-(l) unchanged.]

Source: Great Lakes Valley Conference and Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: If adopted, Proposal No. 31 would not be effective until August

1, 2003, and thus, would not produce the intended benefit of increasing participation at the coaches convention and Division I Women's Final Four until 2004. By amending the effective date of Proposal No. 31 from August 1, 2003, to immediate, Division II women's basketball coaches would have the opportunity to attend both the WBCA Convention and the Division I Women's Final Four in 2003 without suffering a recruiting disadvantage as opposed to 2004.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 32 (NO. 2-37) RECRUITING CALENDAR—WOMEN'S BASKETBALL — AAU EVENTS

Intent: In women's basketball, to limit the number of evaluations at AAU events to a maximum of four during May and June.

Administrative: Amend 30.11.2, Page 292, as follows:

[Division II]

"30.11.2 Basketball, Women's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to women's basketball in Division II:

[30.11.2-(a) through 30.11.2-(h) unchanged]

(i) *During any sanctioned Amateur Athletic Union women's competition occurring between May 18 and June 14 During four sanctioned Amateur Athletic Union women's events occurring between May 18 and June 14 selected at the discretion of the institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics: Evaluation Period"*

[30.11.2-(j) and 30.11.2-(k) unchanged.]

Source: Northeast-10 Conference and New York Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In the months of May and June, the AAU schedules weekend tournaments almost every weekend. Under the parameters set forth in the current recruiting calendar, it is permissible for women's basketball coaches in Division II to evaluate these events every weekend, eliminating the May/June Quiet Period. By limiting such evaluations to four events, coaches will not feel that they need to be present at an event every weekend. This also will reduce recruiting costs and allow coaches to engage in other professional growth opportunities (e.g. clinics), outside of recruiting activities.

Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee agree to take no position on this proposal.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

FINANCIAL AID

NO. 33 (NO. 2-28) FINANCIAL AID — EXEMPTED GOVERNMENT GRANTS — STATE GRANTS

Intent: To exclude from individual and team limits any state government grants awarded solely on bases having no relationship to athletics ability.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.4.1, Pages 150-151, as follows:

[Division II]

“15.2.4.1 Exempted Government Grants. The following government grants for educational purposes shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid or cost of attendance of a student-athlete:

[15.2.4.1-(a) through 15.2.4.1-(h) unchanged.]

- “(i) Welfare Benefits. Welfare benefits received from a state or federal government; *or*
- “(j) Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunities Grant (SEOG). Payments received as part of the SEOG program.; *or*
- “(k) State Government Grants. State Government Grants received by a student-athlete as part of a program in which academic ability and/or financial need are the primary criteria and which have no relationship to athletics ability.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council and Lone Star Conference and Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Increasingly, state governments are establishing financial aid programs in which state grants are provided based on ability and/or academic achievement to students who are residents of the state with the sole stipulation that they be used at a school within the state. Individual institutions may have little input into the selection or amount of the grant. As a student-athlete welfare issue, these grants should be excluded from individual and team limits, as are similar existing federal programs. Existing legislation provides an exemption for similar state grants that do not require the grant to be used at an institution within the state.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

NO. 34 (NO. 2-30) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — CONFERENCE CHALLENGE TOURNAMENT

Intent: In basketball, to permit an institution to exempt one contest

as part of a “conference challenge” from an institution’s maximum contest limitations as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.9.1, Pages 186-187, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.1.9.1 Automatic Exemptions. The following contests are automatically exempted from an institution’s maximum number of contests in all sports each year:

[17.1.9.1-(a) through 17.1.9.1-(g) unchanged.]

“(h) Conference Challenge — Basketball. One contest played prior to December 1 as part of an overall event in which two Division II conferences organize contests between their members. An institution may not use this exemption in the same year in which it participates in the Division II Tip-Off Classic per Bylaw 17.1.9.1-(i).”

[17.1.9.1-(h) through 17.1.9.1-(r) relettered as 17.1.9.1-(i) through 17.1.9.1-(s), unchanged.]

Source: Northeast-10 Conference and New York Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: This exemption would create an opportunity to promote men’s and women’s basketball in Division II. Such events would be “modeled” after similar events currently being conducted in Division I (e.g., Big Ten/ACC Challenge). If adopted, this exemption would allow two conferences to organize an event during the early part of the season in which the conferences would schedule men’s and women’s contests between a specified number of conference member institutions. In theory, the contests would be conducted on campuses with the sites being divided equally between the two conferences. Because such events will provide a unique and memorable competitive experience for Division II basketball student-athletes, the events can be marketed to potential sponsors. Such events may be scheduled between conferences within the same region with the intent of cultivating regional rivalries or they may be scheduled nationally in order to provide not only a competitive experience, but a travel and cultural experience as well.

Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee agree to take no position on this proposal.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 35 (NO. 2-31) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — FIRST CONTEST

Intent: In basketball, to specify that a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition before November 15.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3, Page 196, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.5.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball before *136 days (including Sundays) before the Division I men’s basketball championship game (i.e., November 19, 1999; November 17, 2000; November 16, 2001)* **November 15**, except as provided under Bylaw 17.5.3.1.

“17.5.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted before the first contest dates specified under Bylaw 17.5.3:

[17.5.3.1-(a) through 17.5.3.1-(c), unchanged.]

“(d) NCAA Division I or III Member Institution(s). An exhibition contest against a Division I or III institution exempted per 17.5.2-(h) must be played between November 1 and the first permissible contest date (i.e., November 16, 2001).”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council and Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference, Northeast-10 Conference and New York Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: This proposal establishes November 15 as the consistent start date for the first permissible contest date in men’s basketball. Current legislation establishes the first permissible contest date by counting back 136 days from the date of the Division I men’s basketball championship game. Due to the decision to delay the Division I championship game by a week in future years, the start of the Division II basketball season has been delayed approximately one week. This has caused hardships on many conferences in developing conference schedules, especially when the intervening holiday break is factored in, which now occurs a week earlier in the conference schedule. By establishing November 15 as the first permissible contest date, the need to periodically calculate the first contest date for future years and continually update the Division II Manual will be eliminated. Further, the problem of having the Division II basketball season dictated by the scheduling of the Division I men’s and women’s basketball championship game will also be eliminated. Finally, this proposal will further the deregulation effort by adding basketball to the list of Division II sports that have a consistent start date.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 36 (NO. 2-32) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
FIRST DATE OF PRACTICE — FALL
SPORTS**

Intent: In the sports of cross country, field hockey, football, soccer and women’s volleyball, to specify that an institution shall not begin practice until 21 days prior to the institution’s first date of competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.2, Page 200, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.7.2 First Date of Practice — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in cross country in the championship segment before *August 10 or the first day of class, whichever occurs earlier 21 days prior to the institution's first date of competition.*”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.2, Page 203, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.10.2 First Date of Practice — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in field hockey in the championship segment before *August 10 or the first day of class, whichever occurs earlier 21 days prior to the institution's first date of competition.*”

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.2.1, Page 206, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.11.2.1 First Practice Date - Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence official preseason football practice sessions in the championship segment, for the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team before *August 10 or the first day of class, whichever occurs earlier 21 days prior to the institution's first date of competition.*”

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.19.2, Page 221, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.19.2 First Date of Practice—Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in soccer in the championship segment before *August 10 or the first day of class, whichever occurs earlier 21 days prior to the institution's first date of competition.*”

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.27.2.2, Page 238, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.27.2.2 First Date of Practice — Championship Segment — Women. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in women's volleyball in the championship before *August 10 or the first day of class, whichever occurs earlier 21 days prior to the institution's first date of competition.*”

Source: Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: If the proposed changes to competition start dates are adopted, then these changes to preseason practice start dates also should be adopted to ensure a consistent length of preseason practice. Designating a day of the week as the first date of preseason practice rather than a specific date allows for a constant length of 21 days for preseason practice each year. This proposal also enhances the Division II effort to simplify Bylaw 17.

Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management

Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee opposed this proposal. This proposal is in direct conflict with previous deregulation efforts. In addition, the Councils and Legislation Committee are in opposition to the sport-specific alterations.

SAAC Position: Oppose Part C; Support Parts A, B, D and E.

Action: Part C adopted as amended. Parts A, B, D and E adopted as amended, 135-98-1. Motion to reconsider Parts A, B, D and E approved, 149-82-2. Reconsideration of amended Parts A, B, D and E defeated, 86-144-3.

NO. 37 (NO. 2-33) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — FIRST DATE OF COMPETITION — FALL SPORTS

Intent: In the sports of cross country, field hockey, football, soccer and women's volleyball, to specify that an institution shall not engage in its first date of competition before the Thursday preceding September 1.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.7.3, Page 200, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.7.3 First Date of Competition — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition with outside competition in the championship segment before **the Thursday preceding** September 1 or *the Thursday preceding Labor Day.*”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.3, Page 203, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.10.3 First Date of Competition — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not play its first contest or engage in its first date of competition with outside competition in the championship segment before **the Thursday preceding** September 1 or *the Thursday preceding Labor Day.*”

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.3, Page 206, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.11.3 First Contest — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in the championship segment before **the Thursday preceding** September 1 or *the Thursday preceding Labor Day.*”

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.19.3, Page 221, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.19.3 First Date of Competition — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in the championship segment before **the Thursday preceding** September 1 or *the Thursday preceding Labor Day.*”

Source: Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Using a day of the week for the first date of competition instead of a date allows for a constant number of 13 weeks of play prior to the Thanksgiving weekend each year. This change will permit consistent scheduling of nonconference and conference competition from year to year while maintaining the Division II goal of simplifying fall start dates for cross country, field hockey, football, soccer and women's volleyball.

Committee Position (Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee support this proposal. The proposal creates a "constant" start date rather than one that "floats" with the date of a holiday.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Part C adopted. Parts A, B, D and E adopted.

**NO. 38 (NO. 2-34) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
PERMISSIBLE DATES AND OUT-OF-
SEASON ACTIVITIES — FALL SPORT
EXCEPTION — GOLF AND TENNIS**

Intent: In golf and tennis, to permit an institution that counts golf or tennis as a fall sport and discontinues its championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) to add 15 calendar days to the period of 45 consecutive calendar days available during the nonchampionship segment.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.5.1, Page 208, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.12.5.1 Exception. A member institution that counts golf as a fall sport, per Constitution 3.2.4.10.1, may utilize the playing-season dates for fall sports and must follow out-of-season regulations for fall sports during the spring. Further, an institution that uses this exception and discontinues its championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days to the period of 45 consecutive calendar days available during the nonchampionship segment. The institution shall be eligible for the NCAA championship occurring in the spring."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.8, Page 209, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.12.8 Out-of-Season and Nonchampionship Segment Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the championship segment except for the following:

[17.12.8-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Nonchampionship Segment Activities. During the segment in which the NCAA championship does not occur, student-athletes may participate in any practice or competition activity as permitted by other legislation provided such activity is restricted to a

maximum of 24 days that occur within a period of 45 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced or on days that the institution is closed due to inclement weather, as long as no practice or competition occurs on such days. The 45 consecutive calendar days must be within the dates set forth in Bylaws 17.12.5 and 17.12.6.

(1) Exception. A member institution that counts golf as a fall sport, per Constitution 3.2.4.10.1, and discontinues championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days to the period of 45 consecutive calendar days available during the nonchampionship segment (see Bylaw 17.12.1.1).

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.25.5.1, Page 232, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.25.5.1 Exception. A member institution that counts tennis as a fall sport, per 3.2.4.10.1, may utilize the playing-season dates for fall sports and must follow out-of-season regulations for fall sports during the spring. An institution that uses this exception and discontinues its championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days to the period of 45 consecutive calendar days available during the non-championship segment the following spring. The institution shall be eligible for the NCAA championship occurring in the spring.”

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.25.8, Page 234, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.25.8 Out-of-Season and Nonchampionship Segment Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the championship segment except for the following:

[17.25.8-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) Nonchampionship Segment Activities. During the segment in which the NCAA championship does not occur, student-athletes may participate in any practice or competition activity as permitted by other legislation provided such activity is restricted to a maximum of 24 days that occur within a period of 45 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced or on days that the institution is closed due to inclement weather, as long as no practice or competition occurs on such days. The 45 consecutive calendar days must be within the dates set forth in Bylaws 17.25.5 and 17.25.6.

“(1) Exception. A member institution that counts golf as a fall sport, per Constitution 3.2.4.10.1, and discontinues its championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days to the period of 45 consecutive calendar days available during the nonchampionship segment (see Bylaw 17.25.5.1).”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council and North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The current exception as stated in 2002 Convention Proposal No. 26-D allows an institution to use the fall as its championship segment in golf and tennis. However, most institutions that qualify for this exception, per Constitution 3.2.4.10.1, are located in northern climates. As a result, many institutions encounter very difficult spring weather and therefore need a large window of opportunity in the nonchampionship segment to get in the maximum 24 days of activity. This proposal does not increase the number of days that golf and tennis activity is permitted during the spring season but instead broadens the time period the minimum 24 days of activity may occur. Also, an institution that discontinues its championship athletics segment by November 1 (instead of November 15) would not lose those 15 days of the championship segment but rather would be banking those days as they are simply added to the time period for activity (the 45-day window) in the nonchampionship segment.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

GENERAL

NO. 39

**RESOLUTION — FINANCIAL AID —
MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-
AID LIMITATIONS**

[Division II]

“Whereas, the Division II Philosophy Statement reflects a belief in offering broad-based participation, striving for equitable participation and competitive excellence, and providing for athletically related financial aid to our student athletes; and

“Whereas, the membership considered 13 deregulation proposals regarding financial aid at the 2001 NCAA Convention, leading to the deregulation of rules governing how to count student-athlete employment earning and nonathletic scholarships; and

“Whereas, declining corporate and private financial support and receding public financial support challenge the funding of intercollegiate athletics,

“Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Division II Management Council review the current financial aid limits in all sports by June 1, 2003, report its findings to the membership, and propose legislation for the 2004 NCAA Convention to adjust, if necessary, financial aid limits in specific sports to better reflect the Division II membership and its philosophy.

Source: Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference and Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

SAAC Position: Support.

Action: Adopted.

DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division III athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division III chief executive officers.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division III Management Council or by Division III committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division III Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division III.

The Division III Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division III chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division III Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.13, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date before the first day of August, the proposal rationale statement shall contain reasons for the alternate effective date.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL

*NO. 40 (NO. 2-43) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — FIRST-CONTEST DATE

Intent: In basketball, to establish the first permissible contest date as four weeks following October 15.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3, Page 138, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.5.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball *before the Friday immediately before Thanksgiving until four weeks following October 15 (i.e., November 12, 2003), except as provided under Bylaw 17.5.3.1.”*

Source: State University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: This proposal establishes a set first contest date in basketball, which would allow for more balance in institution's schedules. More game dates would be allowed in the first semester and less in the second semester. Legislation now provides for practice to start October 15. This proposal would establish a set first contest date that allows for four weeks of preseason every year regardless of the calendar jump. The first contest date would no longer constantly change with the Thanksgiving holiday.

Committee Position (Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The NCAA Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee opposes this proposal, as it is inconsistent with the subcommittee's proposed playing and practice seasons model and in some years would result in a first permissible contest date that occurs prior to the Friday immediately before Thanksgiving.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 41 (NO. 2-48)PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PLAYING SEASONS REGULATIONS**

Intent: To revise the playing and practice seasons regulations, as specified.

[Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format. Revisions will be made to the appropriate bylaws to reflect the concepts endorsed by this proposal, if adopted. Below, the sports of archery (representative of emerging sports), football, soccer (representative of fall-season sports), basketball (representative of winter-season sports), and baseball (representative of spring-season sports) are used to illustrate the proposed changes.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.4, Page 126, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.1.4 Sports Subject to Segment Limitations. Segment limitations are applicable to all team sports that are listed under Bylaw 17.02.12.1 and all individual sports listed under Bylaw 17.02.12.2. In those sports for which the National Collegiate Championship is the only NCAA championships opportunity (see Bylaw 18.3), an institution’s playing season shall be limited to **21** **19** weeks.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.9.4, Page 127, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.1.9.4 Traditional and Nontraditional Segment Length — *Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball and Women’s Volleyball* **Fall and Spring Sports.** All practice and competition during the nontraditional segment shall be limited to a maximum of five weeks.”

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.2, Pages 132-134, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.2 ARCHERY, WOMEN’S. Regulations for computing the archery playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (Also see Figures 17-1 and 17-2.)

“17.2.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution’s playing season in archery shall be limited to a maximum of **21 19** weeks (traditional and nontraditional segments combined).

[17.2.2 through 17.2.4 unchanged.]

[17.2.5 unchanged.]

[17.2.5.1 through 17.2.5.2 unchanged.]

“17.2.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in archery shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.2.5.3-(a) through 17.2.5.3-(j) unchanged.]

“(i) Preseason Scrimmages. A maximum of two dates of competition with outside competition in archery may be conducted prior to the first permissible date of competition during the traditional segment, provided that the scrimmages played during these dates of competition are conducted in privacy and no class time is missed by the institution’s participating student-athletes.”

[Remainder 17.2 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.4, Pages 136-138, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.4 BASEBALL. Regulations for computing the baseball-playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (Also see Figure 17-1.)

“17.4.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution’s playing season in baseball shall be limited to a maximum of **21 19** weeks (traditional and nontraditional segments combined).

“17.4.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in baseball before the following dates:

“(a) Traditional Segment. *September 7 or the institution’s first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier. The date that permits a maximum of 25 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game.*

[17.4.2-(b) unchanged.]

“17.4.3 First Contest Date. A member institution shall not play its first contest (*including a scrimmage*) with outside competition in baseball before the following dates:

“(a) Traditional Segment. *September 7 or the institution’s first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier. The*

preceding Friday 10 weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Baseball Championship, except as otherwise permitted in Bylaw 17.19.5.3.

[17.4.3-(b) unchanged.]

"17.4.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (*contests and scrimmages*) in the sport of baseball by the following dates:

[17.4.4-(a) and 17.4.4-(b) unchanged.]

"17.4.5 Number of Contests

"17.4.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of baseball during the institution's baseball playing season to a maximum of **45 40** contests (*games and scrimmages*) with not more than **40 36** during the traditional segment, and not more than **five four** during the nontraditional segment, except for those contests excluded under Bylaw 17.4.5.3.

[17.4.5.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.4.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of **45 40** baseball contests (*games and scrimmages*) with not more than **40 36** during the traditional segment and not more than **five four** during the nontraditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8.

"17.4.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of baseball contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.4.5.3-(a) through 17.4.5.3-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) Preseason Scrimmages. A maximum of two contests with outside competition in baseball may be conducted prior to the first permissible contest during the traditional segment, provided that the contests are conducted in privacy and no class time is missed by the institution's participating student-athletes."

[Remainder of 17.4 unchanged.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.5, Pages 138-140, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.5 BASKETBALL

"17.5.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in basketball shall be limited to a maximum of **21 19** weeks between the start of preseason practice (see Bylaw 17.5.2) and the end of the regular playing season

(see Bylaw 17.5.4). This **21** **19**-week period includes permissible conditioning activities as set forth in Bylaw 17.5.2.1.1. Guidelines for computing the basketball playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations.

“17.5.2 Preseason Practices

“17.5.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions before *October 15 the date that permits a maximum of 25 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game.*

“17.5.2.1.1 Permissible Conditioning Activities. Team conditioning or physical-fitness activities supervised by coaching staff members may be conducted on or off court but shall not begin before *October 15 the date specified in Bylaw 17.5.2.1.*

[Remainder of 17.5.2 unchanged.]

“17.5.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (*game or scrimmage*) with outside competition in basketball before the **preceding Friday immediately before Thanksgiving 15 weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Basketball Championship**, except as provided under Bylaw 17.5.3.1:

“17.5.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (*games or scrimmages*) are permitted before the first contest dates specified under Bylaw 17.5.3:

“(a) Practice Preseason Scrimmages. *A maximum of two informal practice scrimmages with outside competition (conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring) may be conducted between the first permissible date for on-court preseason practice (see Bylaw 17.5.2.1) and the conclusion of the basketball season. Such scrimmages need not be counted against the maximum permissible number of contests. A maximum of two contests with outside competition in basketball may be conducted prior to the first permissible contest, provided that the contests are conducted in privacy and no class time is missed by the institution’s participating student-athletes;*

[17.5.3.1-(b) and 17.5.3.1-(c) unchanged.]

“17.5.4 End of Playing Season. A member institution’s last contest (*game or scrimmage or postseason tournament contest*) with outside competition in the sport of basketball shall not be played after the Division III Men’s Basketball Championship game.

“17.5.5 Number of Contests

[17.5.5.1 through 17.5.5.2 unchanged.]

“17.5.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.5.5.3-(a) through 17.5.5.3-(d) unchanged.]

“(e) Foreign Team in U.S. An exhibition contest against a foreign team in the United States played in the arena in which the member institution regularly plays its home contests; **and**

“(f) *Scrimmages. Two informal practice scrimmages with outside competition in basketball conducted between the first permissible date for on-court practice and the conclusion of the basketball season; and*”

[17.5.5.3-(g) relettered as 17.5.5.3-(f) unchanged.]

[Remainder 17.5 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 17.11, Pages 149-151, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.11 FOOTBALL

“17.11.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution’s playing season in football shall be limited to a maximum of **21 19** weeks between the start of preseason practice (see Bylaw 17.11.2) and the end of the regular playing season (see Bylaw 17.11.4). This **21 19**-week period includes preseason practice activities as set forth in Bylaw 17.11.2. Guidelines for computing the football playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Bylaw 17.11.3 for restrictions on first contest dates.)

[17.11.2 unchanged.]

“17.11.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (*game*) with outside competition in football before the **preceding Friday or Saturday 11 10 weeks before prior to the first round selection date** of the Division III Football Championship, **except as otherwise permitted in Bylaw 17.11.5.3.**

[17.11.4 and 17.11.5 unchanged.]

“17.11.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total regular-season playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of football during the permissible football playing season in any one year to a maximum of 10 contests (*games and scrimmages*), except as provided for all members under Bylaw 17.11.5.3.”

[Remainder of 17.11 unchanged.]

G. Bylaws: Amend 17.19, Pages 166-168, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.19 SOCCER. Regulations for computing the soccer playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (Also see Figure 17-1.)

“17.19.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution’s playing season in soccer shall be limited to a maximum of **21 19** weeks (traditional and nontraditional segments combined).

“17.19.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in soccer before the following dates:

“(a) Traditional Segment. The date that permits a maximum of **16 20** practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game or before September 1, whichever is later.

[17.19.2-(b) unchanged.]

“17.19.3 First Contest or Date of Competition. A member institution shall not play its first contest or engage in its first date of competition (game) with outside competition in soccer before the following dates:

“(a) Traditional Segment. *September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday, except that an unlimited number of exhibition scrimmages may be conducted on one date during the preseason practice period (see Bylaw 17.19.2), which shall count as one date of competition in the institution’s maximum limitation on contests or dates of competition. The preceding Friday nine weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Soccer Championship, except as otherwise permitted in Bylaw 17.19.5.3.*

[17.19.3-(b) unchanged.]

“17.19.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in the sport of soccer by the following dates:

[17.19.4-(a) and 17.19.4-(b) unchanged.]

[17.19.5 unchanged.]

“17.19.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of soccer during the institution’s soccer playing season in any one year to a maximum of **20 18** contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and four dates of competition during another segment, except for those contests and/or dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.19.5.3, 17.19.5.4 and 17.19.5.5 [see also Bylaw 17.19.3-(a)].

“17.19.5.1.1 Scrimmages/Exhibition Games. A member institution may play up to three soccer scrimmages or exhibition games (which shall not count toward the institution’s won-lost record) before the first scheduled contest during a particular academic year,

provided such scrimmages or exhibition games are conducted during the institution's declared playing season per Bylaw 17.19.1 and are counted against the maximum number of contests [see also Bylaw 17.19.3].

[17.19.5.1.2 renumbered as 17.19.5.1.1 unchanged.]

“17.19.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 20 ~~18~~ soccer contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and four dates of competition in soccer during another segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8.

“17.19.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of soccer contests and dates of competition shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.19.5.4-(a) through 17.19.5.4-(h) unchanged.]

“(i) Preseason Scrimmages. A maximum of two contests with outside competition in soccer may be conducted prior to the first permissible contest during the traditional segment, provided that the contests are conducted in privacy and no class time is missed by the institution's participating student-athletes.”

[Remainder of 17.19 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2004.

Rationale: This proposal addresses inconsistent approaches found within Bylaw 17, the lack of any basic principle on which current legislation is based, and the impact that sport-specific legislation adopted over the years has had within the bylaw. The proposed changes strive to create a playing and practice seasons model that is consistent among sports and that provides opportunities for students to pursue excellence in athletics and academics. This proposed model provides the opportunity for student-athletes to adequately prepare for athletics competition; engage in outside competition; be provided a championships (regional and/or national) opportunity; and engage in academic endeavors and the social and cultural activities of their respective institution. To address concerns regarding preparation time and weather-related issues, the total playing and practice season for all sports would be limited to 19 weeks. Under this proposal, contest limitations generally have been established on an average of one to two contests per week. Furthermore, a consistent formula will be used to establish

permissible start dates for competition and practice. Each sport (other than football) would receive two exempted preseason scrimmages or dates of competition during the traditional segment, provided the contest or date of competition is conducted in privacy and no class time is missed.

Action: Defeated, 166-196-6, as amended.

*NO. 41-1

**PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
PLAYING SEASONS REGULATIONS**

Intent: To amend 2003 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 41, as specified.

Please see Appendix B for additional details regarding the application of this proposal.

[Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format. Revisions will be made to the appropriate bylaws to reflect the concepts endorsed by this proposal, if adopted. Below, the sports of football, soccer (representative of fall-season sports), basketball (representative of winter-season sports), and baseball (representative of spring-season sports) are used to illustrate the proposed changes.]

A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 41, 17.1.4, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.1.4 Sports Subject to Segment Limitations. Segment limitations are applicable to all team sports that are listed under Bylaw 17.02.12.1 and all individual sports listed under Bylaw 17.02.12.2. In those sports for which the National Collegiate Championship is the only NCAA championships opportunity (see Bylaw 18.3), an institution’s playing season shall be limited to 19 weeks **for winter and spring sports and no more than 18 weeks for fall sports.**”

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 41, 17.1.9.4 by adding new 17.1.9.4.1, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.1.9.4 Traditional and Nontraditional Segment Length — Fall and Spring Sports. All practice and competition during the nontraditional segment shall be limited to a maximum of five weeks.

“17.1.9.4.1 Exception — Golf, Women’s Rowing, and Tennis. In women’s rowing, an institution’s nontraditional segment may exceed five weeks. In addition, a member institution that conducts its nontraditional segment of golf or tennis in the fall and meets the requirements of Bylaw 17.1.9.3 may have a nontraditional segment in golf or tennis that exceeds five weeks.”

C. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 41, 17.4, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.4 BASEBALL. Regulations for computing the baseball-playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (Also see Figure 17-1.)

[17.4.1 unchanged.]

“17.4.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in baseball before the following dates:

“(a) Traditional Segment. *The date that permits a maximum of 25 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game. The date 14 weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Baseball Championship.*

[17.4.2-(b) unchanged.]

“17.4.3 First Contest Date. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in baseball before the following dates:

“(a) Traditional Segment. *The preceding Friday 10 weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Baseball Championship except as otherwise permitted in Bylaw 17.19.5.3 The date 14 weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Baseball Championship.*

[Remainder of 17.4.3-(b) unchanged.]

[Remainder of 17.4 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 41, 17.5, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.5 BASKETBALL

[17.5.1 unchanged.]

“17.5.2 Preseason Practices

“17.5.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions before the date *that permits a maximum of 25 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game 19 consecutive weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Basketball Championship.*

[17.5.2.1.1 unchanged.]

[Remainder of 17.5.2 unchanged.]

“17.5.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in basketball before the *preceding Friday 15 weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Basketball Championship Friday immediately before Thanksgiving*, except as provided under Bylaw 17.5.3.1.”

E. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 41, 17.11, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.11 FOOTBALL

“17.11.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution’s playing season in football shall be limited to a maximum of *19 18 weeks between the start of preseason practice*

(see Bylaw 17.11.2) and the end of the regular playing season (see Bylaw 17.11.4). This **19 18**-week period includes preseason practice activities as set forth in Bylaw 17.11.2. Guidelines for computing the football playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Bylaw 17.11.3 for restrictions on first contest dates.)

[17.11.2 unchanged.]

"17.11.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in football *before the preceding Friday 10 weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Football Championship prior to 11 weeks before the first round of the Division III Football Championships*, except as otherwise permitted in Bylaw 17.11.5.3."

[Remainder of 17.11 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 41, 17.19, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.19 SOCCER. Regulations for computing the soccer playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (Also see Figure 17-1.)

"17.19.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in soccer shall be limited to a maximum of **19 18** weeks (traditional and nontraditional segments combined).

"17.19.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in soccer before the following dates:

"(a) Traditional Segment. The date that permits a *maximum of 20 practice opportunities (see Bylaw 17.02.11) before the first scheduled intercollegiate game* **16 practice opportunities prior to the first intercollegiate contest.**

[17.19.2-(b) unchanged.]

"17.19.3 First Contest or Date of Competition. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in soccer before the following dates:

"(a) Traditional Segment. *The preceding Friday nine weeks prior to the selection date of the Division III Soccer Championship September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday*, except as otherwise permitted in Bylaw 17.19.5.3.

[Remainder of 17.19.3-(b) unchanged.]

[Remainder of 17.19 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2004

Rationale: Based on additional feedback from the membership, the subcommittee has revised its proposed playing and practice seasons model to allow for greater institutional autonomy and discretion, while maintaining the model's most significant components (i.e., length of overall playing seasons, contest limitations, preseason exempt scrimmages). The model's goal of consistency is still achieved. However, the revised model will promote easier application of the proposed legislation and will alleviate confusion.

Action: Adopted, 184-179-2.

***NO. 42 (NO. 2-51)EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS —
SELECTION OF TEAMS FOR
CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION —
AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION**

Intent: To revise automatic qualification policies in team sports, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 31.3.4 by adding new 31.3.4.4, Page 255, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.4.4 Principles for Establishing Bracket Sizes. In team sports, overall bracket sizes shall be established based on an approximate access ratio of 1:6.5. The overall bracket size shall be determined by dividing the total number of active Division III institutions sponsoring the sport by 6.5 and then adjusted as necessary by the Championships Committee. Bracket composition shall be based on three pools (A, B and C) and shall be established using the following principles:

- “(a) Pool A is reserved for the champions of conferences eligible for automatic qualification. Each conference eligible for automatic qualification is allocated one berth.
- “(b) Pool B is reserved for independent institutions and institutions that are members of conferences that do not receive automatic qualification. The number of eligible institutions in Pool B is determined by subtracting the number of eligible institutions in Pool A (total number of institutions in conferences with automatic qualification) from the total number of active Division III institutions sponsoring the sport. The number of berths available for Pool B institutions is determined by dividing the number of institutions eligible in Pool B by the access ratio for Pool A (total number of institutions in conferences with automatic qualification divided by the number of Division III conferences with automatic qualification).
- “(c) Pool C is reserved for institutions in conferences with automatic qualification that are not the conference

champion plus remaining independents and members of nonqualifying conferences. The number of Pool C berths is determined by subtracting Pool A and Pool B from the total bracket size.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2005.

Rationale: The Council supports legislation to establish a 1:6.5 access ratio for the following reasons: (a) A 1:6.5 ratio parallels bracket sizes from other models distributed to the membership in the spring 2002 championships survey. The models all provided larger field sizes and responded to the membership feedback related to greater access for at-large teams; (b) It provides equitable access in all three pools; (c) It provides more equitable institutional access whether an institution is a member of an AQ conference or not; (d) It provides a formula — because the ratio is lower (6.5) — that reacts more quickly to membership growth; (e) Given that the formula for establishing bracket sizes and pool allocations is similar to what is currently in place (i.e., Pool A is adjusted upward when new AQ conferences meet the requirements and the other pools are adjusted accordingly within the established bracket size), the Council, based on recommendations from the Championships Committee, believes that if there is a time when Pool C access is diminished, that a commitment to minimum access in Pool C will be maintained (currently a minimum of two Pool C berths is recommended unless compelling factors mandate otherwise); (f) Changes do not extend total championship weeks; (g) The Championships Committee will be charged with adjusting bracket sizes based on principles established by the Management Council and the Presidents Council (e.g., access ratios that create “odd bracket sizes” should be rounded down); and (h) Changes reflect the continued commitment to fund strategic initiatives as part of the work of the Division III Initiatives Task Force.

Action: Adopted, 306-59-3.

***NO. 43 (NO. 2-52) EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS —
SELECTION OF TEAMS AND
INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS**

Intent: To require that in all sports at least 50 percent of the championship field originally designated for the respective sport shall be reserved for at-large berths, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 31.3 by adding new 31.3.5 and 31.3.6, Pages 253-256, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“31.3.5 Championship Field Size — Automatic Qualification and At-Large Berths. In all sports, at least 50 percent of the championship field originally designated for the re-

spective sport shall be reserved for at-large berths. If the number of conferences that meet the automatic qualification requirements in a sport exceeds the amount equal to 50 percent of the championship field originally designated for that sport, the Championships Committee and the respective governing-sport committee shall add one berth to the championship field in that sport for every qualifying conference over the amount equal to 50 percent of the originally designated field size. The Management Council, by a three-fourths majority of its members present and voting, may waive or modify this requirement for a specific sport if it determines that the number of berths remaining after the allocation for automatic-qualifying conferences is sufficient to allow appropriate representation of other member institutions in the respective championship field.

[31.3.5 and 31.3.6 renumbered as 31.3.7 and 31.3.8 unchanged.]

“31.3.6 Selection Pools for Team Sports. In all designated team sports, berths in each respective championship field shall be allocated, in order, via three pools designated as Pools A, B and C respectively.

- “(a) Pool A shall comprise the champions of all conferences receiving automatic qualification.
- “(b) The effective access ratio of Pool A shall be determined by dividing the total membership of all conferences receiving automatic qualification by the number of automatic qualifying conferences and rounding to the nearest integer.
- “(c) Pool B shall comprise all independent institutions and representatives of conferences not receiving automatic qualification. Representatives of the Pool B shall be selected as per 31.3.6.
- “(d) The access ratio for Pool B shall be the same as the effective access ratio for Pool A.
- “(e) Pool C shall comprise all remaining teams from Pool A and Pool B not previously selected or designated as the recipient of their respective conferences’ automatic bids. Representatives of Pool C shall be selected as per 31.3.6. “

Source: University Athletic Association

Effective Date: August 1, 2005.

Rationale: Automatic qualification for conference champions provides equitable access for student-athletes who have demonstrated their qualifications through conference play. Similarly, provision of adequate at-large berths provides equitable opportunities for student-athletes who have demonstrated their qualifications are comparable to those of the overall pool of conference champions. If one purpose of national championships is to provide opportunities for student-athletes to measure their talents against the best of their peers, then it is important that both interests be fairly repre-

sented in the championship fields. This proposal presents a reasonable compromise between the two competing interests by adjusting field sizes relative to the number of automatic-qualifying conferences sponsoring competition in a sport. It is based on a principle of reserving at least 50 percent of the original field for at-large berths and adding one berth for each qualifying conference that exceeds the amount equal to 50 percent of the original field size. It responds to changes in initial field size (as determined by sport sponsorship) and to changes in the number of automatic-qualifying conferences. This proposal also provides equal access opportunities for all member institutions. All institutions will have the opportunity to qualify through two pools. Members of automatic-qualifying conferences in a given sport can qualify through Pools A and C. Independents and representatives of non-qualifying conferences can qualify through Pools B and C. Additionally, the same effective selection ratios are applied to both Pools A and B.

Committee Position (Management Council): The NCAA Division III Management Council took no official position regarding this proposal but prefers Proposal No. 42.

Action: Rendered moot with the passage of Proposal No. 42.

GENERAL

NO. 44 (NO. 2-38) AMATEURISM — PROFESSIONAL TEAM — DEFINITION

Intent: To specify that a professional team is an organized team that provides any of its players more than actual and necessary expenses, as specified, or declares itself to be a professional team.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.02.4, Page 51, as follows:

[Division III]

“12.02.4 Professional Athletics Team. A professional team is any organized team that:

“(a) *Is a member of a recognized professional sports organization.*

Provides any of its players more than actual and necessary expenses for participation on the team, except as otherwise permitted by NCAA legislation. Actual and necessary expenses are limited to the following, provided the value of these items is commensurate with the fair market value in the locality of the player(s) and is not excessive in nature:

“(1) Meals directly tied to competition and practice held in preparation for such competition;

“(2) Lodging directly tied to competition and practice held in preparation for such competition;

“(3) Apparel, equipment and supplies tied to competition or practice;

- “(4) Coaching and instruction;
 - “(5) Health/medical insurance;
 - “(6) Transportation (i.e., expenses to and from practice and competition, cost of transportation from home to training/practice site at the beginning of the season and from training/practice site to home at the end of the season;
 - “(7) Medical treatment and physical therapy;
 - “(8) Facility usage; and
 - “(9) Entry fees; or
- “(b) Is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization, except as permitted in Bylaw 12.6.1.8 (see also Bylaw 12.6.1); **Declares itself to be professional.**
- “(c) Is a member of a playing league that is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization (see also Bylaw 12.6.1); or
- “(d) Has an athlete receiving for his or her participation any kind of payment, directly or indirectly, from a professional team or professional sports organization (see also Bylaw 12.6.1.1).”

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.6.1.7, Page 63, as follows:

[Division III]

“12.6.1.7 Youth Teams. An individual may participate on a youth team, including a team consisting of prospects, sponsored by a professional sports team or organization without jeopardizing inter-collegiate eligibility in that sport, provided the following conditions are met:

- “(a) The youth team must otherwise be an amateur team;*
- “(b) Sponsorship fees provided to the team are not earmarked for a particular individual; and*
- “(c) The team is not controlled, owned or operated to any extent by a professional team or organization.”*

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Amateurism Task Force)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The current definition of a professional team has been used by the membership since 1974. This proposal amends the definition of a professional team for several reasons. First, the current reinstatement process handles cases involving “low” levels of amateur competition that result in a violation due to the team receiving funding indirectly from a professional team. For example, there are international youth teams in the sports of soccer and basketball that accept funding from professional teams and, thus, are considered professional teams under the current definition. Under the proposed definition, any participant’s actual and necessary expenses no longer would be considered professional.

Further, sophisticated amateur competition can escape the current definition of a professional team even if the amateur team provides pay to its players. This proposal would address this loophole. Second, the current definition uses the word “professional” seven times. This proposal would use it only once in the actual definition. The concern of unintentionally affecting the eligibility of individuals who are playing on a “low-level” team is minimized; however, the task force recognizes that if there is competition that inappropriately results in a team being defined as professional, the reinstatement process will consider the mitigation. Third, under the current definition, it is possible for a team to pay its players but still not be considered a professional team as long as the pay does not come from a team, league or organization that labels itself as professional. This seems to contradict the basic premise of professional athletics. Finally, in our global environment, it is increasingly difficult to understand how international teams operate in the context of the current definition, since many countries and leagues define “professional” differently. To focus on whether the team pays its players or whether it calls itself professional likely will bring greater consistency in the application of NCAA rules to domestic and international student-athletes.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 45 (NO. 2-39) RECRUITING — DEFINITION OF CONTACT

Intent: To define a recruiting “contact” as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 13.02 by adding new 13.02.2, Page 66, as follows:

[Division III]

“13.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

[13.02.1 unchanged.]

“13.02.2 Contact. A contact is any face-to-face encounter between a prospect or the prospect’s parents, relatives or legal guardian(s) and an institutional staff member or athletics representative during which any dialogue occurs in excess of an exchange of a greeting. Any such face-to-face encounter that is prearranged or that takes place on the grounds of the prospect’s educational institution or at the site of organized competition or practice involving the prospect or the prospect’s high-school, preparatory school, two-year college or all-star team shall be considered a contact, regardless of the conversation that occurs.”

[13.02.2 through 13.02.8 renumbered as 13.02.3 through 13.02.9, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: NCAA Bylaw 13.1 (contact and evaluations) indicates that “recruiting contacts with a prospect (or the prospect’s relatives or legal guardians) by institutional staff members and/or representatives of the institution’s athletics interests are subject to the provisions set forth in this bylaw.” However, the term “contact” is never defined within Division III legislation. The definition of contact, as used in Divisions I and II, was adopted in 1980. At that time, Division III institutions did not consider the proposal, since it was specific to Divisions I and II only. Revisions to the definition in 1994 only were considered by Divisions I and II. Since then, no comparable legislation has been proposed for Division III institutions. As it appears to be a mere oversight that this legislation was never considered, Division III should adopt the same definition of contact that is currently used in Divisions I and II.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 46 (NO. 2-40) RECRUITING — ELIGIBILITY
RAMIFICATIONS — RESTITUTION FOR
IMPROPER BENEFITS**

Intent: To specify circumstances in which an institution does not have to declare ineligible and seek restoration on behalf of a prospective student-athlete who received an improper benefit while a prospect, provided the individual repays the value of the benefit.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.5 by adding new 13.5.6, Page 70, as follows:

[Division III]

“13.5 ENTERTAINMENT

[13.5.1 through 13.5.5 unchanged.]

“13.5.6 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of Bylaw 13.5 in which the value of the entertainment is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual’s repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.6 by adding new 13.7.6.1, Page 75, as follows:

[Division III]

“13.7.6 Lodging for Additional Persons. Additional persons (e.g., prospect’s brother, sister, friend) may stay in the same room as the

prospect or parents, spouse or legal guardian(s) of the prospect, but the institution shall not pay the costs resulting from the additional occupants. The additional occupants shall not be prospects being recruited by the institution. For violations of this bylaw, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospect or student-athlete) shall not be affected, conditioned on the individual repaying the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time that the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.

“13.7.6.1 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution of Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of Bylaw 13.7.7 in which the value of the lodging for additional persons is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.”

- C. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.13.2.1 by adding new 13.13.2.1.1.4, Page 81, as follows:

[Division III]

“13.13.2.1 Student-Athletes

[13.13.2.1.1 unchanged.]

[13.13.2.1.1.1 through 13.13.2.1.1.3 unchanged.]

“13.13.2.1.1.4 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of Bylaw 13.13.2.1.1 in which the value of the excessive compensation is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.”

[13.13.2.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Presently, the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee reviews violations filed in regard to these bylaws. A review of the determinations made in such cases revealed that most if not all required repayment. In addition, violations of the stated bylaws involve situations where the prospective student-athlete had little or no culpability. Therefore, amending the bylaws to incorporate the restitution clause furthers the spirit of deregulation and will facilitate the reduction of cases required to be processed by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and NCAA staff.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 47 (NO. 2-41) RECRUITING — DE MINIMUS VIOLATIONS

Intent: To specify that violations of Bylaws 13.7.4 (accommodations on official visits), 13.7.5.5.2 (multiple hosts), 13.11.6 (photograph of prospect), and 13.14.1 (coach involvement) are de minimus in nature.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.4, Page 73, as follows:

[Division III]

“13.7.4 Accommodations on Official Visit. A prospect on an official visit shall be provided lodging and take meals as regular students normally do. Local commercial facilities may be used but at a scale comparable to that of normal student life and only within a 30-mile radius of the institution’s campus. (See Bylaw 13.7.5.7 for restrictions on meals provided to prospects on official visits.) **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete’s eligibility.**”

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.5.2, Page 74, as follows:

[Division III]

“13.7.5.5.2 Multiple Hosts. If several students host a prospect, the \$20-per-day entertainment money may be used to cover the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the prospect and all hosts. Only one student host per prospect may be provided a free meal if restaurant facilities are used. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete’s eligibility.**”

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.6, Page 78, as follows:

[Division III]

“13.11.6 Photograph of Prospect. It is permissible for an institution to photograph a prospect during a campus visit to be used in the institution’s permissible publicity and promotional activities (e.g., press re-

lease, media guide), but the photograph may not be given to the prospect. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.14.1, Page 82, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.14.1 Coach Involvement. A member institution shall not permit any coach or athletics department staff member directly involved in the recruiting of student-athletes to participate (directly or indirectly) in the management, coaching, officiating, supervision, promotion or player selection of any all-star team or contest involving interscholastic players or those who, during the previous school year, were members of high-school athletics teams. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."**

[13.14.1.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: In reviewing reinstatement cases, no penalty has been imposed on prospective student-athletes involved in violations of these bylaws. In addition, the prospective student-athletes have little or no culpability in such violations. Amending these bylaws to incorporate the de minimis clause is in the spirit of deregulation and will continue to reduce the number of cases processed by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and NCAA staff.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 48 (NO. 2-42) ELIGIBILITY — SEASON OF COMPETITION — WAIVER

Intent: To establish a season-of-competition waiver that may be granted due to extenuating circumstances for student-athletes who competed while eligible in a limited amount of competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.2 by adding new 14.2.7, Page 95, as follows:

[Division III]

"14.2.7 Season-of-Competition Waiver — Competition While Eligible. A student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition by the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement when, due to extenuating circumstances (per Bylaw 14.2.7.1.2), the student-athlete, while eligible, participated in a limited amount of competition. The competition must have occurred under all of the following conditions:

"(a) The competition occurred while the student-athlete was representing an NCAA institution;

- “(b) The competition occurred within the first half of the traditional segment;
- “(c) The student-athlete did not compete in more than three contests or dates of competition (whichever is applicable to that sport) or one-third (whichever number is greater) of the institution's completed contests or dates of competition in his or her sport. All competition (including a scrimmage) against outside participants shall be countable under this limitation in calculating both the number of contests or dates of competition in which the student-athlete participated and the number of contests or dates of competition during that season (both segments) in the sport.

“14.2.7.1 Administrative Criteria. The following criteria shall be employed in the administration of this season-of-competition waiver:

“14.2.7.1.1 Percent Calculation. The requirements specified in Bylaw 14.2.5.2.5 shall apply to the percent calculation specified in this waiver.

“14.2.7.1.2 Extenuating Circumstances. Extenuating circumstances include, but are not limited to, the following:

- “(a) The student-athlete officially withdrew from the institution as a result of a life-threatening injury or illness suffered by a member of the student-athlete's immediate family, which clearly is supported by contemporaneous medical documentation;
- “(b) The student-athlete officially withdrew from the institution as a result of extreme financial difficulties as a result of a specific event (e.g., layoff, death in family) experienced by the student-athlete or an individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent. These circumstances must be clearly supported by objective documentation (e.g., decree of bankruptcy, proof of termination) and must be beyond the control of the student-athlete or the individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent;
- “(c) The student-athlete's institution dropped the sport (in which the student has practiced or competed) from its intercollegiate program.

“14.2.7.1.3 Penalty. A student-athlete who is granted a waiver pursuant to Bylaw 14.2.7 shall be withheld from one contest of intercollegiate competition for each contest in which he or she competed.

“14.2.7.1.4 Review Authority. In cases where a student-athlete does not meet the extenuating circum-

stances listed in Bylaw 14.2.7.1.2, the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement shall have authority to review and grant waivers based on additional documented extenuating circumstances.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.6, Page 94, as follows:

[Division III]

“14.2.6 Season-Of-Competition Waiver — Competition While Ineligible. In conjunction with a request for restoration of eligibility and any conditions imposed thereon per Bylaw 14.12, a student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition by the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement when he or she participated in a limited amount of competition as a result of a good-faith, erroneous formal declaration of eligibility by the institution’s appropriate certifying authority or a student-athlete’s good-faith, erroneous reliance on a coaching staff member’s decision to put the student-athlete into competition prior to the coaching staff member receiving a formal declaration of the student-athlete’s eligibility from the institution’s appropriate certifying authority. The competition must have occurred under all of the following conditions:

[14.2.6-(a) through 14.2.6-(e) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Administrative Review Subcommittee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003 (for competition occurring on or after August 1, 2003).

Rationale: This proposal is based on the number of requests submitted by the membership and reviewed and granted by the subcommittee to waive Bylaw 14.2.4.1 (Minimum Amount of Competition). Establishing specific criteria through legislation can reasonably expand the season-of-competition waiver to include eligible student-athletes. The increasing number of requests being submitted by the membership has created criteria that can be reviewed in a more equitable manner through a legislated waiver. The maximum amount of competition permitted under Bylaw 14.2.7 is consistent with the maximum competition requirements of a hardship waiver, since in either case, the qualifying circumstances are beyond the control of the student-athlete. Regarding the one-for-one condition, the subcommittee notes that it currently grants waivers of Bylaw 14.2.4.1 conditioned on a one-for-one withholding condition and this condition is used based on competitive equity reasons.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 49 (NO. 2-44) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
NONCOLLEGIATE, AMATEUR
COMPETITION — BASKETBALL**

Intent: In basketball, to permit a student-athlete to compete in non-

collegiate, amateur basketball competition outside the institution's intercollegiate basketball season.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.7, Pages 98-100, as follows:

[Division III]

"14.7 OUTSIDE COMPETITION, EFFECTS ON ELIGIBILITY. The eligibility of a student-athlete who engages in outside competition (see 17.02.9) is affected as set forth in the following regulations.

"14.7.1 Outside Competition, Sports Other Than Basketball. A student-athlete becomes ineligible for intercollegiate competition for the remainder of the season in his or her sport (*other than basketball*) if, after enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he or she competes or has competed as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) during the institution's intercollegiate season in the sport (see Bylaw 14.7.5 **3** for exceptions and waivers) unless restored to eligibility before that time by the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement.

"14.7.2 Outside Competition, Basketball. A student-athlete who participates in any organized basketball competition except while representing the institution in intercollegiate competition in accordance with the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 17.5 becomes ineligible for any further intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball (see Bylaw 14.7.5 for exceptions and waivers).

"14.7.3 **2 Additional Applications of Outside-Competition Regulations, Sports other than Basketball.**

[14.7.3.1 through 14.7.3.6 renumbered as 14.7.2.1 through 14.7.2.6 unchanged.]

"14.7.4 Additional Applications of Outside-Competition Regulations, Basketball.

"14.7.4.1 Organized Basketball Competition. Outside basketball competition, including competition involving teams with fewer than five players, shall be considered "organized" if any one of the following conditions exists:

- "(a)** Teams are regularly formed, or team rosters are predetermined;
- "(b)** Competition is scheduled and publicized in advance;
- "(c)** Official score is kept;
- "(d)** Individual or team standings are maintained;
- "(e)** Official timer or game officials are used;
- "(f)** Team uniforms are used;
- "(g)** Admission is charged;
- "(h)** A team is privately or commercially sponsored; or
- "(i)** Competition is either directly or indirectly sponsored,

promoted or administered by an individual, an organization or any other agency.

“14.7.4.2 Individual Subject to Outside-Competition Regulations. Once a student-athlete becomes a candidate for the institution’s basketball team (i.e., has reported for the squad), or if the student was recruited by a member institution in part for basketball ability and subsequently enrolls in the institution, this prohibition against outside organized basketball competition remains applicable until the student-athlete’s intercollegiate basketball eligibility has been exhausted. This includes time while the student is officially withdrawn from college, fulfilling a residence requirement subsequent to transfer to another college, awaiting transfer or enrolled in a nonmember collegiate institution.

“14.7.4.3 Nonrecruited, Nonparticipant. Participation by a student-athlete in organized basketball competition while enrolled in a member institution and having participated in a sport other than basketball would not jeopardize the student’s eligibility in the sport of basketball if the individual had not been recruited in basketball and had not participated on or been a candidate for the institution’s intercollegiate basketball team.”

[14.4.7.4.4 renumbered as 14.7.2.7 unchanged.]

[14.7.5 through 14.7.6 renumbered as 14.7.3 through 14.7.4 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.5.8.1, Page 140, as follows:

[Division III]

“17.5.8.1 Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition. A student-athlete shall be ruled ineligible for intercollegiate basketball competition if the student participates in any organized basketball competition except while representing the member institution or except as permitted in accordance with Bylaws 14.7.5 and 14.7.4.4 for the remainder of the season if, after enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate basketball team, he or she competes or has competed as a member of any outside basketball team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) during the institution’s intercollegiate basketball season.”

Source: State University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: The Division III philosophy has been that the student-athlete is not to be treated any differently than other students with respect to the student-athlete’s financial aid, registration, work programs, admissions, etc. Student-athletes receive no special aid or consideration for participation, and, in that regard, the basketball experience is a part of the total educational process at the Di-

vision III level. However, student-athletes in the sport of basketball are not being treated like all other students and student-athletes when they are deprived of the opportunity to participate before and after the basketball season with their friends in events such as 3-on-3 tournaments during the academic year. If the student-athletes at the Division III level are to be treated like every other student and student-athlete on campus, then they should be allowed to participate with their friends before and after the season in recreational basketball programs.

Committee Position (Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The NCAA Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee supports this proposal. The subcommittee noted that the proposal advances student-athlete welfare and is consistent with the Division III philosophy.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 50 (NO. 2-45) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — NUMBER OF CONTESTS — ICE HOCKEY

Intent: In women's ice hockey, to decrease the maximum number of contests from 34 to 25.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.14.5.1, Pages 156-157, as follows:

[Division III]

“17.14.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the institution’s ice hockey playing season in the sport of women’s ice hockey to a maximum of ~~34~~ 25 contests and in the sport of men’s ice hockey to a maximum of 25 contests (games or scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under Bylaws 17.14.5.3 and 17.14.5.5.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.14.5.2, Page 157, as follows:

[Division III]

“17.14.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of ~~34~~ 25 contests in women’s ice hockey and in men’s ice hockey in a maximum of 25 contests. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Women’s ice hockey is currently permitted 34 contests, nine more than the current men’s maximum limitation. The current limit is the same number as permitted in Divisions I and II and is based on the fact that women’s ice hockey is a national collegiate championship sport for Divisions I and II. Up until the

2001-02 academic year, Division III participated in the National Collegiate Championship. Division III now sponsors its own championship. Thus, the contest limitation should mirror the men's limitation.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 51 (NO. 2-46) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
TENNIS — PRESEASON PRACTICE**

Intent: In tennis, to provide institutions that conduct the traditional segment in the fall with 16 practice opportunities before the first contest or September 1, whichever is later.

Bylaw: Amend 17.25.2, Page 179, as follows:

[Division III]

“17.25.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in tennis before the following dates:

- “(a) Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution’s first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.
- “(1) Exception. An institution that conducts its traditional segment during the fall per Bylaw 17.1.9.2 may commence practice *August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution’s fall term, whichever date occurs first on the date that permits a maximum of 16 practice opportunities before the first scheduled intercollegiate contest or before September 1, whichever is later.*”

[Remainder of 17.25.2 unchanged.]

Source: Pennsylvania Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: A number of Division III institutions conduct their traditional tennis season in the fall. Unlike other fall team sports, current legislation does not provide tennis teams at institutions an opportunity to engage in preseason conditioning. Conditioning is just as important to the health of tennis student-athletes as it is to student-athletes in other fall sports. This proposal attempts to correct the current inequity by permitting those institutions that conduct their traditional tennis season in the fall with 16 preseason practice opportunities prior to the start of classes. In doing so, the proposal affords tennis student-athletes the proper amount of time for skill development and conditioning without conflicting with the Division III philosophy.

Committee Position (Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The NCAA Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee supports this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 52 (NO. 2-47) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — INDOOR AND OUTDOOR TRACK AND FIELD — LENGTH OF PLAYING SEASON

Intent: To specify that an institution that sponsors indoor or outdoor track and field (but not both) is limited to a playing and practice season of 21 weeks.

Bylaws: Amend 17.26.1, Page 181, as follows:

[Division III]

“17.26.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution’s playing season in indoor and outdoor track and field shall be limited to a maximum of 26 weeks for indoor and outdoor track and field combined (traditional and nontraditional segments combined). The length of an institution’s playing season in indoor and outdoor track and field shall be limited to the following:

- “(a) An institution that sponsors only indoor or outdoor track and field (but not both) shall be limited to a maximum playing season of 21 weeks.”**
- “(b) An institution that sponsors both indoor and outdoor track and field shall be limited to a maximum playing season of 26 weeks.”**

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2003

Rationale: The sports of indoor and outdoor track and field currently are permitted a playing season of 26 weeks combined. There is no clear legislative limitation for an institution that sponsors one but not the other sport. This legislation simply would limit an institution that sponsors only one of the two sports to a 21-week playing and practice season. An institution that sponsors both sports still would be permitted to participate in the current 26-week playing and practice season.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 53 (NO. 2-49) NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CHAMPIONSHIPS — WOMEN’S BOWLING

Intent: To establish a National Collegiate Championship in women’s bowling, effective 2003-04.

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.3, Page 195, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“18.3 CURRENT CHAMPIONSHIPS. The Association will administer 87 ~~88~~ national championships in 2002-03. Ten ~~Eleven~~ are National Collegiate Championships. Additionally, there are 26 Division I championships, 25 Division II championships and 27 Division III championships. (See Bylaw 31.02.2 for information about the classification and terminology of championships and see Con-

stitution 5.3.11.1 and 5.3.11.2 for the voting requirements for the establishment of a new championship.) The championships for 2002-03 are as follows:

[The remainder of 18.3 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.02.5, Page 207, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“20.02.5 Emerging Sports for Women. The following shall be considered emerging sports for women and countable for purposes of revenue distribution (i.e., for sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid):

[20.02.5-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) Individual Sports: archery, badminton, *bowling* and squash.”

“[Remainder of 20.02.5 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 21.3, Page 223, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3 COMMON COMMITTEES — COMMITTEES WITH PLAYING RULES AND CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

[21.3.1 unchanged.]

“21.3.2 Bowling Committee, Women’s. The Women’s Bowling Committee shall consist of six members, including the secretary rules editor.”

[21.3.2 through 21.3.10 renumbered as 21.3.3 through 21.3.11, unchanged.]

D. Administrative: Amend 31.4.6.4, Page 258, as follows:

[Division III]

“31.4.6.4 Official Traveling Parties. The following are the approved official traveling parties for which expenses shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of this section:

“National Collegiate Women’s Bowling 13”

Source: NCAA Division III Management Council (Championships Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 2003.

Rationale: Thirty-nine institutions currently sponsor women's bowling. One more Division I institution has indicated that it intends to sponsor the sport effective with the 2003-04 academic year. The sport will then meet the legislative requirements to establish a National Collegiate Championship per NCAA Bylaw 18.2.4.1.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 54 (NO. 2-50) MEMBERSHIP — EMERGING SPORTS — RUGBY

Intent: To add rugby as an emerging sport for women.

Bylaws: Amend 20.02.5, Page 207, as follows:

[Division III]

“20.02.5 Emerging Sports for Women. The following shall be considered emerging sports for women and countable for purposes of revenue distribution (i.e., for sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid):

“(a) Team sports: team handball, **rugby** and synchronized swimming; and”

[20.02.5-(b) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Women’s Athletics)].

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The Committee on Women’s Athletics noted that it has received 10 letters for support from member institutions and that the established criteria has been met to add rugby to the list of emerging sports for women.

Action: Adopted.